SURVEY

April 1967
10s $1.50

a journal of
Soviet and East European studies

The Soviet Union and 'The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution' in China

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUSSIANA

A series of previously out-of-print general, historical and social works selected and edited for reprint by Professor Alexandre V. Soloviev of the University of Geneva.

"Nikolaevskie zandarmy i literatura. 1826-1855"
Author M. K. Lemke.
Orig. Pub. St. Petersburg 1909.
Presents a vivid picture of Russian literature's struggle against severe censorship during the reign of Nicholas I.
Price 6 gns.

"Ocerk torgovli Moskovskogo gosudarstva v XVI i XVII stoletiach"
Author N. I. Kostomarov.
Orig. Pub. St. Petersburg 1862.
This survey of the trade of Muscovite Russia is the best written on the subject up to our time.
Price £3 12s. 0d.

"Knjazoe pravo v drebnej Rusi. Ocerki po istorii X-XII stoletij"
Author A. E. Presnjakov.
Orig. Pub. St. Petersburg 1909.
Explains the very complicated right of princes in the 10th-12th centuries in Kievian Russia, especially the conflict between the aspiration to unity of the State and the feudal rights of individual princes.
Price £3 12s. 0d.

Full details of all these and other Russian reprints available from:

S R PUBLISHERS LTD
East Ardsley, Wakefield, Yorks.

ESTUDIOS INTERNACIONALES

Revista del Instituto de Estudios Internacionales de la Universidad de Chile

Volúmen 1º, Número 1, Abril 1967

Contenido

Arnold Toynbee
El estudio de la historia contémporanea

John Gittings
Tiene China una política exterior?

Richard Gott
El sur de Africa y el fin de la guerra fría

Claudio Véliz
América Latina y el fin de la guerra fría

Felipe Herrera
Viabilidad de la integración Latinoaméricana

Osvaldo Sunkel
La política de desarrollo y la dependencia externa

Resúmenes de libros
Documento
Comunicado oficial emitido por los Presidentes Kenneth Kaunda y Eduardo Frei el dia 30 de Noviembre de 1966 en Santiago.

Precio
U.S. $1.50 por ejemplar, franqueo incluído.

Dirigirso a:
Departamento de Subscripciones
Estudios Internacionales
Instituto de Estudios Internacionales de la Universidad de Chile
Miguel Claro 509
Santiago de Chile

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SURVEY

A Journal of Soviet and East European Studies

No. 63 **April 1967**

Editors: Walter Laqueur, Leo Labedz

The Soviet Union and 'The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution' in China

Introduction ..... *Leopold Labedz* 3
The Soviet Press on the 'Cultural Revolution' 9
Official Exchanges and Comments 15
Inside China: Eyewitnesses 44
Red Guards and Posters 55
Literature, the Arts, Education 64
The Press 81
Cultural Exchanges 90
The Dictatorship of the Proletariat 113
The Army 118
Communist Party Opinion 122
'Collusion' with the United States 127
Diplomatic Protests 131
The Chinese Road to Socialism for Russia and Poland 139
The Personality Cult in Russia and China 159

Editorial offices, Summit House, 1 Langham Place, London, W.1.
Subscription office, Ilford House, 133 Oxford Street, London, W.1.
Subscription rates: £1 10s. or $4 a year. Single copies 7/6 or $1.25.

American Distributors: Franklin Square Subscription Agency, 545 Cedar Lane, Teaneck, New Jersey, U.S.A., with whom subscriptions may be entered.

Survey is published by Information Bulletin, Ltd., 133 Oxford Street, London, W.1, on behalf of the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Economics

E. PREOBRAZHENSKY

Translated by BRIAN PEARCE *with an Introduction by* A. NOVE

'. . . nobody at all interested in the history of the debate on Russia, or on the relationship of ideology and policy, can afford to ignore it.' *Michael Kidron in* INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM *55s net*

Polish and Hungarian Poetry

1945–1956

GEORGE GÖMÖRI

In a comparative study of the poetry of two similar cultures, the author has concentrated on poetry with a 'message,' in a period which was rich in political changes and produced much 'committed' poetry. *45s net*

Soviet Affairs: Number Four

Edited by MICHAEL KASER

Subjects included in this collection of eight papers are *The Russian Peasant, Choices Facing the Soviet Planner, Recent Population Trends in the U.S.S.R.* and *Soviet Farm Output and Food Supply in 1970.* 11 *text figures* *30s net* *St Antony's Papers Number 19*

Soviet Chess

Chess and Communism in the U.S.S.R.

D. J. RICHARDS

'. . . highly readable . . . not to be missed by anyone with an interest in chess, or the Soviet Union, or both.' *J. J. Mackintosh in* OXFORD MAGAZINE *25s net*

The Ili Crisis

A Study of Sino-Russian Diplomacy 1878–1881

IMMANUEL C. Y. HSÜ

This book provides the historical perspective for understanding Sino-Russian tensions in the border area. '. . . a scholarly and exhilarating study . . .' SPECTATOR 5 *text figures* *45s net*

A Study of the Chinese Communist Movement 1927-1934

SHANTI SWARUP

'It is obviously important to go beyond the description of particular revolutions to an understanding of the revolutionary process, and Mr Swarup shows definite talent for this type of analysis.' THE TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT *35s net*

The Merchant of Revolution

The Life of Alexander Israel Helphand (Parvus) 1867–1924

Z. A. B. ZEMAN and W. B. SCHARLAU

'. . . a well-constructed, fully documented biography, ably translated where it needed translating . . .' THE TIMES 13 *plates* *45s net*

Rosa Luxemburg

J. P. NETTL

'Mr Nettl is good on every count. . . . No book has made a greater contribution to historical knowledge for a very long time.' *A. J. P. Taylor in* THE OBSERVER 26 *plates*, 2 *volumes* £6 *6s net*

Oxford University Press

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE 'GREAT PROLETARIAN CULTURAL REVOLUTION' IN CHINA

Leopold Labedz

Because of the 'Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution', the Sino-Soviet conflict has reached a new pitch of intensity. The Soviet reaction to the events in China and the exchanges between the two sides are documented in this issue of SURVEY. They cover the period between February 1966 and March 1967, from the day when Brezhnev invited the Communist Party of China to send a delegation to the twenty-third congress of the CPSU and was rebuffed, to the point when the new 'moderation' of the 'triple alliance' in China was interpreted by the Russians as a tactical manoeuvre, and Brezhnev declared that 'these stratagems' changed nothing in the anti-revolutionary character of Mao's policy.

'China explodes', 'Red Rebels, Red Chaos'—these were some of the early headlines in leading British newspapers. In February–March 1967 some journals diagnosed the 'End of the Great Convulsion', 'The Last Whimpers of the China Revolt', while others took it as only a temporary lull. Throughout the whole affair, the international press provided diametrically opposite interpretations. The *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (18 February 1967) even suggested that the whole thing was a sham, that Mao himself was building up his opponents in order to implement his permanent revolution, and that the reports about the serious character of the internal struggle in China were grossly exaggerated. But even leaving aside such flights of imagination, there was no agreement among the analysts about the meaning of Mao's 'retreat', as there was none about the significance of the 'cultural revolution' itself.

The 'old China hands' raised their hands in despair, the new 'China watchers' hopefully scanned scraps of evidence provided by the Japanese correspondents in Peking about the Red Guard posters (the French said the personality cult could not develop in France because of 'La loi du 28 juillet 1881—Défense d'afficher') The heirs of the (Kremlinological) revolution, the Pekinologists, provided satirical material for *Punch* which poked fun at their contrasting interpretations. *The Observer* complained: 'Trying to interpret what is happening in China today is like trying to watch a football match being played in the dark'. And Mr. R. Palme Dutt in the communist *Morning Star* warned his readers that 'experienced socialists will view with distrust the reports appearing in the capitalist press'.

Fortunately, there was no need to rely on 'the capitalist press' alone; the Soviet press provided no less extensive coverage of the 'Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution' in China, and the picture

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not all that different. It is indeed the first time in thirty years that the present writer has found in the Soviet press some information about an outside event which supplemented that provided by the western press. But of course the Soviet press coverage has other functions than information pure and simple, and therefore its timing and its extent is no less revealing than its content; although occasionally it throws an additional light on the 'cultural revolution' itself, it is the Soviet interpretation of it which is of greatest interest. Needless to say, it tells us more about the Soviet perspective than about the Chinese prospects. It certainly tells us quite a lot about the state of Sino-Soviet relations.

With the 'cultural revolution' the Sino-Soviet conflict entered a new stage. Until 1963 the polemics between the two countries were indirect and esoteric. Later on they became open and increasingly acrimonious; on the whole they centred on a doctrinal dispute about the correct line for the international communist movement. While Soviet historians were refuting the claims of the Chinese historians, on a more contemporary level the Chinese began to stress the internal sins of the Soviet 'revisionists'. But, with some exceptions, the Russians tended to avoid detailed denunciation of the internal policies of the Chinese leadership. After Khrushchev's fall, the new Soviet leaders stopped polemics on their side. They were resumed only after the outbreak of the 'cultural revolution'.

This time Soviet criticism of China acquired a new dimension. After a modest beginning the Soviet press gave its readers a comprehensive exposure of the iniquities of the 'cultural revolution', long before the siege of the Soviet embassy in Peking. It did not just criticise the Chinese treatment of the Soviet students and visitors; it attacked the 'barbaric excesses' of the 'cultural revolution' in China in all its manifestations, the 'hooliganism', the 'pogroms', and 'terror' of the Red Guards, their outrages against the Chinese cultural legacy, and the persecution of the intellectuals. In doing so the Soviet press has shifted the emphasis from doctrinal polemics to 'human angle' descriptions of the actual happenings. It has thus for the first time since the beginning of the Sino-Soviet conflict addressed itself directly to the population as a whole.

This is significant for many reasons. First, it indicates the acknowledgement by Brezhnev and Kosygin that, like Khrushchev, they have failed to restrain the Chinese and can no longer maintain silence in face of Chinese provocations. Second, it shows that they consider the situation grave enough to warrant a direct mass appeal. And, last but not least, it entails some internal political risks, which probably accounts for the reluctance of the Soviet leaders to get involved in polemics on the internal policies of the two parties.

What are these risks? Evidently they have nothing to do with the exploitation of Russian patriotic feelings. On the contrary, this can only make the government more popular. Polycentrism has led in the last

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

few years to a resurgence of nationalism in all communist countries, including Russia. It is evident also among the intellectuals, manifesting itself in a hundred ways in their increased preoccupation with Russian achievements, and it can be illustrated by many instances ranging from the enthusiastic reception of Stravinsky to the recent campaign of the *Literary Gazette* to bring the 'sacred relics' of Russian culture from abroad back to Russia. An appeal to Russian sentiments, conditioned as they are by the archetypal memories of the 'Tatar yoke', against the menace from the East, is a safe political bet.

But the Soviet people are conditioned not only by Russian history, but also by Soviet history. Looking at the Chinese 'cultural revolution' in the mirror of the Soviet press, they are bound to be struck by some parallels with their own recent past. What matters here is not so much whether and how far these parallels can be used in the analysis of the 'cultural revolution', but the political fact that they undoubtedly impress themselves upon the mind of the Soviet public. The extensive character of Soviet press coverage of the 'cultural revolution' can only underline such parallels, even though they are scrupulously avoided. When this press condemns the Chinese 'cultural revolution' it is *a fortiori* castigating the Soviet Stalinist past, holding its mirror image before the Soviet public, ironically enough at the very moment when a shamefaced attempt at a partial rehabilitation of Stalin is being made.

ABOVE a certain age, the Soviet citizen automatically reacts to press descriptions of the exploits of the Red Guards and other manifestations of the 'cultural revolution', by recalling his own experience.

The cult of Mao? Only a western commentator could write that Stalin was not deified as Mao is. The Soviet public knows better. The Little Red Book of quotations from Mao has its predecessor in Stalin's *Short Course* of party history which ran into fifty million copies. Admittedly, excerpts from it were not chanted in unison in public, but its fourth chapter (attributed to Stalin) was memorised by countless Soviet citizens. True, it was not recommended to preserve rotting water melons, and young *komsomoltsy* were not seen swimming with copies of it held above their heads. But the Soviet public remembers that Stalin's writings were hailed as great contributions to every conceivable subject, from ornithology to paleontology, long before the Chinese discovery that Mao's thoughts play a similar role (*Peking Review* calls the Chinese nuclear explosion a 'Great victory for Mao Tse-tung's thought, Magnificent fruit of the Great Cultural Revolution').

Persecution of the intellectuals? The public recantations? The harassing of the competent? The suicide of those threatened or humiliated? The purge of party leaders? Obviously, Mao cannot yet say, 'Anything Stalin could do, I can do better . . .' Stalin had a firmer hold over the party apparatus and had no need to mount a children's crusade against it; he operated with the blue caps of the NKVD troops, not with the dunce's caps of the Red Guards. He did not

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have to use the army and the spectre of famine did not prevent him from extending his 'second revolution' to the countryside. When he wrote 'Dizzy with success' the economic operation was over; politically it was consummated only with the *Yezhovshchina*. Of course, because the economic conditions in China are different, it is more difficult for her to become a great power. For these and other historical reasons the 'second revolution' in China may go a different way and may have different results from the one which took place in the thirties in Russia. Yet the Soviet public, conditioned as it is by its own historical experience, and exposed to the commentaries of the Soviet press, which stresses the role of the army and of the security police in the Chinese 'cultural revolution', is not inclined to expect that it will stop half-way. Unlike the Chinese, the Russians know little about 'the first emperor stereotype', the founders of new dynasties in China who overreached themselves.

The Russians think they know where the Chinese have learnt most of this from, in respect both of practice and theory, which is another way of saying that 'Maoism represents a particular type of Chinese response to western Marxism through the Bolshevik model'. They may not be aware of the role of Chinese history in the shaping of Maoism, but in the short run it may be more relevant that Mao has learnt more from Stalin than from the *Analects*. He may be an original political tactician, but his celebrated 'Quotations' are simply home-spun formulations taken from Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist texts. China may have a long tradition of absolutist rulers and of the political theory that goes with it, but the 'cultural revolution' is historically *sui generis*. Its justification is sought not in Hsun tze and the legalists, but in the Paris Commune, so that even if the Soviet public tends to oversimplify the situation by instinctively confining itself to parallels with its own past, it may be less far off the mark than some of the western commentators. But our concern here is not the right or the wrong interpretation of the Chinese 'cultural revolution', but the Soviet reaction to it, conditioned as it is by its own historical biases and traumas.

The treatment of foreign diplomats? A Soviet citizen does not have to recall the Boxer uprising. He knows well enough that the technique of 'organised spontaneity' in front of foreign embassies has been developed in the Soviet Union and that the Soviet embassy in Peking simply received a bigger dose of the medicine so often applied (not only under Stalin) to western embassies in Moscow.

Of course it is not just a question of the contrast between the explicit, emphatic, and extensive condemnation in the Soviet press of Maoist practices, and the avoidance of a similar explicit, emphatic, and extensive condemnation of the Soviet *unbewältigte Vergangenheit*. Exposing the Chinese control of the press and its skullduggery, poking fun at the Maoist *Gleichschaltung* of the individual, condemning the imposed uniformity of thought in China, complaining

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Maoists disregard the Chinese Constitution, showing indignation at the denial of cultural or political rights to the national minorities or at the pressure on writers, artists, and intellectuals—all these preoccupations of the Soviet press since the 'cultural revolution' only highlight its own inconsistency and invite a *tu quoque*.

It is ironic to read the Chinese attacks on Sholokhov, who wholeheartedly approved the trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel. What can Soviet artists, reading these fulminations against the Chinese rejection of western art, feel about the closing down of exhibitions of modern Soviet painting or of the Chagall exhibition? *Literary Gazette* demanded that the body of Shalyapin should be brought back to Russia. What sense does it make to provide access to the body of a great emigré Russian singer and to deny access to the paintings of a great living emigré Russian painter?

The Soviet public may notice the irony of the fact that at the time of the reign of lawlessness in China changes have been introduced in the Russian Criminal Code making it easier to suppress criticism 'legally'. It may also be struck by the incongruity of the attempt to use Stalin's *Short Course* in the new volume of party history (see p. 159). It is a double irony that shortly after Soviet citizens were compelled to crawl under Stalin's portrait in Peking, Stalin's daughter requested asylum in the West. It must all be very bewildering to the Soviet public.

WILL the 'cultural revolution' provide the external stimulus for 'destalinisation' in the wider political realm when the internal stimulus has been flagging? Will not only the intellectuals but the *apparatchiki* draw the more liberal conclusions for their general political orientation from the events in China? Or will they simply use them to maintain or even reinforce their political control by exploiting patriotic sentiments? The answer to these questions depends only partly on further developments in China.

Soviet propaganda is doing its best to show that the Maoist leaders have ceased to be Marxist-Leninists. Its first concern was to establish this point in order to prove the need for an international communist conference at which the isolation of China could be politically consummated. But it is bound to be more and more concerned with the real thing and not just with doctrinal embellishment.

The Soviet interpretation of the 'cultural revolution' has stressed its anti-party character, the role of the army, and that of the political police. It was reluctant to be outspoken about the struggle for power in China; although the Soviet leaders presumably had some information about it, they would not be likely to disclose it; the Soviet press was careful not to give the impression of their being involved. It did not reply to the charges of the *People's Daily* of 1 July 1966 that the three attempts of the 'subversive groups to bring the [Maoist] government down' in the last sixteen years—that of Kao Kang, of Peng Teh-huai, and the third

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one being presumably that of Peng Chen—all had the support of 'Soviet revisionists'. Only during his visit to Britain did Kosygin explicitly declare his 'sympathy' for the anti-Maoists, a sympathy which is evident in the Soviet press, but which may not be reciprocated.

Whatever the outcome of the 'cultural revolution', it is already clear that it may have a not insignificant impact on the Soviet Union. Ideologically, it emphasises still further the contrast between the revolutionary fundamentalism in Peking and the erosion of the chiliastic perspective in Moscow.

In foreign policy, the elevation in Peking of the Soviet Union to the position of 'Enemy Number One', the anti-Soviet mass demonstrations, and the frontier tensions, must bring home to the Soviet leaders more strongly than ever before in the history of the Sino-Soviet conflict the fact of the basic political change in the post-war situation of the Soviet Union. Before the war it faced with anxiety the rise of Japan and of Germany. After the war it had only America to contend with. Now, facing east and west, it views with anxiety China and the revival of Europe, as well as the American 'imperialists'. In this situation the historical options open to the Soviet leaders, apart from the traditional game of dividing opponents, look quite different from what they did when Stalin was expanding and consolidating the Soviet empire.

Internally, the Chinese 'cultural revolution' may not bring Russia into Europe, but it may perhaps bring Russia closer to European ways of thought. One recent example may or may not be a straw in the wind. Andrei Voznesensky, in a poem published in *Literaturnaya Rossiya*, refers to Russia's historical mission to defend European civilisation against the menace from the East. He writes about Khan Khuchum—who obviously stands for contemporary China—who rises above the horde in a mushroom cloud! But Russia will receive in its body 'all the shots destined for Rome and Vienna'. The poet exclaims that it is 'once again Russia, always Russia, eternally Russia'.

In effect, fifty years after the revolution, Blok's Scythians are identified by another Russian poet, this time not with the Russians, but with the Chinese. The Slavophile tradition is here taking upon itself the mission to defend, rather than reject, Europe, an illustration of the impact of the Chinese 'cultural revolution' on at least one Russian poet's imagination.

Such are the ways of culture in the twentieth century.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOVIET PRESS ON THE 'CULTURAL REVOLUTION'

During the past year or so, Soviet press and radio coverage of China has built up from the timid reproduction of three Chinese articles to a daily spate of material which attempts to cover every aspect of Chinese internal and external policy. The main gaps in this coverage relate to activities that may concern the safety of the Soviet frontier and speculation about the future of the Chinese leadership.

After the fall of Khrushchev in October 1964, the new Soviet leaders kept their promise not to engage in open polemics with the Chinese for as long as possible. Whatever may have been circulated privately, the Soviet press confined itself to occasional expressions of regret that the Chinese were splitting the international communist movement (*Pravda*, 8 August 1965) and denunciations of Chinese attacks on the Soviet Union (*Pravda*, 16 November 1965).

The cultural revolution was formally launched in China on 14 April 1966, at a meeting of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. As events became more and more disturbing, the Soviet press began to take note and to reply, its first shot being the reprinting in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, of 5 May, of Kuo Mo-jo's abject speech of self-criticism. It was not clear whether this was intended primarily as an attack on 'Stalinist' attitudes in China, or was in some way designed as an object lesson to Soviet intellectuals, to show them that they should be grateful for small mercies. When, on 24 May, the same newspaper republished another Chinese article: 'Let us talk about the philosophical question of selling water melons in large towns', it became clear that the intention was to ridicule the more absurd aspects of the cult of Mao Tse-tung. *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, on 31 May, published the famous article on how table-tennis players should learn from the thought of Chairman Mao. Each of these articles was preceded by a short, factual introduction prepared by Tass, emphasising that their publication had been arranged at official rather than editorial level.

The number of reports about China increased slightly and the tone began to change in June, as it became clearer that Lin Piao and the army were in the ascendant. By carefully selecting quotations from the Chinese press, *Pravda* made clear on 26 June its strong disapproval of events in China. It stated: 'In the foreign communist press attention is being drawn to the fact that the sharp edge of the struggle is not directed against the bourgeoisie itself, which is preserving its familiar positions. It is precisely the party cadres and intelligentsia who are being named "class enemies", "representatives of the bourgeoisie who have infiltrated the party and even bourgeois monarchists." One must also note that the present campaign is being widely used by the Chinese press for anti-Soviet attacks.'

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The hint of dissensions within the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) must have reminded Soviet readers of the purges of the 1930s. The *Pravda* article made it clear that the trouble concerned not a minute fraction of the party, but a large section and possibly even a majority. The reference to 'the foreign communist press' is characteristic. It was at this time that the Soviet press, notably *Za Rubezhom* (which is largely devoted to foreign publications), began to reprint anti-Chinese articles from the communist and western press alike—a device which enabled it to paint a negative picture of events in China while apparently abstaining from polemics.

As events gathered speed in July and August, press coverage of events in China increased in volume. The technique of reprinting Chinese articles was used to good effect by *Literaturnaya Gazeta* of 21 July and 8 August, when the dislocation of the Chinese educational system and Chinese condemnation of the ideological shortcomings of such figures as Shakespeare, Stendhal, Pushkin, Balzac, and Beethoven were featured. The 8 August article was ironically headlined 'The Chinese press on the cultural inheritance of the peoples'. Quotations from foreign communist publications were supplemented by such items as the account in the *US News and World Report* of the Sino-American ambassadorial talks in Warsaw (quoted in *Pravda* on 28 July), which was a neat riposte to Chinese charges of Soviet collusion with the Americans.

Compared with this cautious approach, Soviet broadcasts in Chinese took a stronger line. A Moscow radio broadcast on 20 July stated: 'The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) has strongly condemned the purging methods of criticism and self-criticism employed in the era of the cult of Stalin, because they ran counter to the practice of the Leninist party and the Soviet state. This kind of criticism was often started on instructions from superior officials and ended with a purge of those who had been critcised'. The comparison between Maoist and Stalinist purges was inescapable.

The plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CCP during the first twelve days of August, and the reply by the Central Committee of the CPSU on 31 August to its resolution, pushed the Sino-Soviet conflict into a new phase. *Pravda* on 20 August remarked that the Chinese were diverging from the general line of the international communist movement, that they had slandered the Soviet Union, and that Mao Tse-tung had been proclaimed 'the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our time'. The CPSU statement of 31 August noted that since the end of the plenum 'the anti-Soviet campaign which had been conducted systematically in China for a long time has flared up with new force'. It placed the entire responsibility for the split on the Chinese, but added that the Soviet side would continue to strive towards unity. The Soviet press immediately gave prominence to the statement of the French Communist Party of 31 August; a speech by Novotny; statements by the Bulgarian, East German, Argentine, and Finnish Communist Parties; editorials in

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Hungarian, Cuban, Austrian, Indian, British, and Ecuador Communist Party newspapers, and interviews given by prominent foreign communists. All condemned China's divisive policy and the excesses of the cultural revolution. *Pravda*, on 3 September, emphasised that the Red Guards, who had been established by the August plenum of the CCP's Central Committee, were the creatures of Chairman Mao. It made much of their brutality and mentioned that they were being resisted by the general population. The demonstrations against the Soviet embassy in Peking were reported together with the Soviet démarches. *Za Rubezhom* devoted two full pages to China, and similar space was thereafter quite frequent. The number for that week quoted *The Scotsman* as suggesting that the cultural revolution might be intended by Lin Piao to break down the existing structure of the CCP and to subordinate the party to new mass organisations.

The Soviet press campaign entered a more forceful stage on 16 September, when *Pravda* published a long article by its own correspondent in Peking, who pointed out that attacks by the Red Guards on party committee members and others were becoming increasingly violent. Why, he asked, are youths and children criticising communists while the working class does not participate? Clearly, because the workers support the communists. *Pravda* added that the Red Guards were now talking of international action.

Soviet readers were, however, still not given an official line explaining the course of events, but were largely left to speculate for themselves on the basis of the foreign commentaries reproduced in *Za Rubezhom*. The main ideological articles of this period, 'Socialism and the Cultural Inheritance' (*Pravda*, 16 September), 'National Interests and Proletarian Internationalism' (*Pravda*, 19 September) and 'The International Principles of Socialism' (*Izvestiya*, 20 September), scarcely mentioned the Chinese by name, confining themselves to moderate, reasoned statements about Soviet policy with regard to other parties and the unity of the communist movement. Such statements served to reassure the other parties, while increasing Soviet prestige and underlining China's isolation and intransigence.

Articles about China began to appear every day after 16 September with *Komsomolskaya Pravda* taking the lead in reports of Red Guard and anti-Soviet activities. It reported on 18 September an unpublished decision to reorganise the Chinese youth movement which had been accused of being 'a weapon for the restoration of capitalism'. This decision, like much other information, was gleaned from the Red Guards' leaflets. *Pravda*, on 23 September, noted a growing connection between the Red Guards and the state security service and army, reporting that the Red Guards were expected to 'devote serious study to the army'. After a recital of their brutalities *Pravda* went on: 'It is pointed out that they have achieved "undying feats" and "have met with the warm approval of Chairman Mao Tse-tung".' In its comments the Soviet press still refrained from referring to a conflict within

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Chinese leadership or to the role of the army; but quotations in *Za Rubezhom* from Spanish and Czechoslovak communist sources made it clear that the Red Guards' campaign was, in the words of the Bratislava newspaper, *Predvoj*, on 14 September, 'a stage in a tough political battle for the future orientation of China'. The Soviet leaders were probably becoming deeply concerned that attacks on the party, the centre of order and authority, might become a threat to the very foundations of the Chinese communist state.

Pravda pointed out on 1 October—the seventeenth anniversary of the establishment of the CPR—the extent to which the Soviet Union had helped China in the past, but on the following day carried an anti-Chinese article from the Polish *Trybuna Ludu*. *Za Rubezhom* that week carried Günther Mittag's speech at the East German SED plenum, reprinted from *Neues Deutschland*, which was the sharpest statement on Chinese internal and foreign policies yet revealed to the Soviet public. Mittag, head of the Bureau for Industry in the Politbureau, asserted that they represented 'a mixture of petit-bourgeois nationalism, adventurism, great-power chauvinism, and racialism'. In the same number *Za Rubezhom* quoted *Mundo Obrero*, organ of the Spanish Communist Party, as saying that the cultural revolution was directed against a section of the Chinese leadership and was being organised by a minority. Articles by Augusto Livi in *Paese Sera* and Jean-Emile Vidal in *l'Humanité* commented on 'the growing role which the leading Peking group, headed by Lin Piao, would like to give to the army in the affairs of the country'. By 22 October Moscow radio was speaking of a 'purge of the party and state apparatus', and the Soviet press campaign was in full swing. The attacks on the Chinese Komsomol were reported in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* on 15 and 18 October; *Trud* on 15 October and *Komsomolskaya Pravda* on 27 October lamented the destruction of cultural antiquities; *Izvestiya* on 5 November produced some information on Sino-American trade; *Komsomolskaya Pravda* on 19 October described how the turmoil in China was affecting production, while *Pravda* constantly denounced China's divisive activities which, in its view, were weakening the communist effort in Vietnam and elsewhere.

November provided some special occasions for abuse which stood out against the general background of mutual recrimination. The Soviet Ministry of Higher Education published, on 2 November, a statement denouncing the Chinese attitude to cultural exchanges, which had led in September to the expulsion of Soviet students from China. Thereafter, the Soviet press featured a number of interviews with the students —particularly *Literaturnaya Gazeta* on 17 November and *Za Rubezhom* on 16–22 December. The celebrations and speeches on the anniversary of the October Revolution provoked further abuse and walk-outs. The premature return of a delegation of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, led by *Pravda's* correspondent Victor Mayevsky, caused Tass to announce on 19 November that the visit had been cut short because the Chinese had ignored 'the elementary rules of hospitality'. A

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

member of the delegation, in a Moscow radio broadcast on 28 November, described the philistinism of the Red Guards and the control exercised over them by the army. The centenary of the birth of Sun Yat-sen was widely celebrated in the Soviet press, which stressed his advocacy of friendship between the Soviet Union and China. The Chinese replied by accusing the Russians of distorting Sun Yat-sen's views; he was a predecessor of Mao, and had spoken of the need to regain China's lost territories.

The threads of previous Soviet propaganda were drawn together by *Pravda* in a weighty editorial on 27 November. The strongest attack yet made on China by the Soviet leaders, it maintained that the Chinese leaders, although formally attacking 'imperialism', had declared the Soviet Union to be 'enemy No. 1', and were hostile to the parties in other communist countries. The editorial dwelt on the complete unorthodoxy of the Chinese leaders: 'Maoism' had been proclaimed the official ideology of China, with Mao himself 'far above Marx, Engels, and Lenin'. China's refusal to take part in joint action to aid the North Vietnamese was used by *Pravda* to imply collusion with the United States, and her isolation was contrasted with growing Soviet prestige. The most serious accusation was that 'Mao Tse-tung and his group' were determined to press on with 'the public dishonouring and destruction' of the cadres of their own party, precisely because they saw in the party the main obstacle to their present course. *Pravda* was careful to distinguish between Mao's group and the Chinese party and people. Expressing the belief that the Soviet and Chinese parties would be reunited, *Pravda* made it clear that this would not happen until the cult of Mao Tse-tung had been overthrown. This thinly veiled call to the CCP to act against Mao and his supporters was broadcast to China in Chinese.

The editorial was followed on 13 December by a Central Committee resolution which formally announced the reopening of Soviet polemics with China. Although more moderately worded than the denunciations made under Khrushchev, the resolution declared that the policies of the Chinese leaders had 'nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism'. Furthermore, the plenum considered it necessary 'resolutely to expose the anti-Leninist views and great-power nationalist course of the present Chinese leaders, and to intensify the struggle to defend Marxism-Leninism and the general line worked out by the Moscow Conferences of 1957 and 1960'. No doubt as a reprisal for the editorial and the resolution, the Chinese took the unprecedented step on 16 December of expelling three of the six Soviet correspondents in Peking on the ground that they had slandered 'the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution'.

Since mid-December, the bulk of Soviet press comment on China has been based on the ideas contained in the *Pravda* editorial of 27 November and the resolution of 13 December—particularly on the latter's vague statement that Chinese policy 'has entered a new and dangerous phase'. Elaborations of these ideas by Soviet and other communist

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leaders have often included favourable references to the convening of a world communist conference. *Za Rubezhom*, by its selection of foreign press material, has stressed the isolation of China; Moscow radio, on 9, 10 and 11 December, described the economic consequences of the cultural revolution, while *Trud* on 6 January discussed the lowering of living standards in China against the background of the upheavals reported from many cities. It asked: 'Why have Mao Tse-tung and his group been obliged to create new political organisations and abolish the old? This is no accident. The fact is that the course of Mao Tse-tung and his group in relation to the vital interests and livelihood of the toilers has become bankrupt and no longer finds support.'

One particularly interesting line of reporting has been taken up by the Soviet army newspaper *Krasnaya Zvezda*. On 29 December it carried an article designed to inform Soviet servicemen of the role of the People's Liberation Army in current events in China. The article hinted that sectarianism had gone so far in China that the Chinese might stand aside in any future Soviet-American clash: 'Having entered upon an anti-Marxist, anti-Soviet path, replacing Marxism-Leninism with Mao Tse-tungism and proletarian internationalism with great power chauvinism, they [the leaders of the CCP] deny the need to unite the military might of the socialist states to cut short imperialist aggression, to destroy imperialism completely in the event of the unleashing by imperialism of a new world war'.

Incidents such as the detention of the ship *Zagorsk* at Dairen have been fully featured, and the correctness of Soviet behaviour has been lengthily contrasted with China's awkwardness. *Literaturnaya Gazeta* of 20 December, in an article entitled 'Washington and the Bellicose Rhetoric of Peking', suggested that China's abuse of America was a mere smokescreen. In reality, the Americans favoured China because of its splitting activities, and China found its trade with America too profitable to be affected by considerations of conscience.

Growing opposition to Mao was the theme of an article in *Pravda* on 15 January. The newspaper said that the clashes reflected the growing disaffection of a wide section of Chinese society—and particularly the working class—over the actions of the Red Guards and their organisers. The Red Guards, it went on, 'are naming more and more enemies of the ideas of Mao Tse-tung from among party and state, workers, scientists and literary and artistic figures'.

This theme has become a subject of innumerable articles in the Soviet press. There are too many of them to be mentioned individually. In 1967 the trickle became a flood. Practically every day, *Pravda* and *Izvestiya* carried a column entitled, 'Events in China', 'The Situation in China', reporting the latest developments. The weeklies and other periodicals carried special articles on this or that aspect of the 'cultural revolution', but these were simply expansions of the original theme, using arguments already used before.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OFFICIAL EXCHANGES AND COMMENTS

Letter from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

Moscow,
24 February 1966

Comrade Mao Tse-tung
The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China

Dear Comrades,

The forthcoming 23rd congress of the CPSU will be convened on 29 March 1966.

The agenda of the congress has been planned as follows:

1. The Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU—by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU.
2. The Report of the Central Audit Commission of the CPSU—by Comrade N. A. Muravyeva, Chairman of the Audit Commission.
3. The directives of the 23rd congress of the CPSU on the five-year plan for the development of the national economy of the USSR from 1966 to 1970—by Comrade A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.
4. The election of the central organs of the Party.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union invites a delegation of the Communist Party of China to attend the 23rd congress of the CPSU as guests.

With communist greetings,

L. BREZHNEV,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Reply from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Peking,
22 March 1966

The Central Committee of the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union
Dear Comrades,

The Communist Party of China has received the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated 24

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

February 1966 inviting us to send a delegation to attend your 23rd congress as guests.

In normal circumstances, it would be considered an indication of friendship for one Party to invite another fraternal Party to send a delegation to its congress. But around the time you sent this invitation, you distributed an anti-Chinese document in the Soviet Union both inside and outside the Party, and organised a whole series of anti-Chinese reports from top to bottom, right down to the basic units, whipping up hysteria against China. Moreover, you sent an anti-Chinese letter to other Parties, instigating them to join you in opposing China. You wantonly vilified the Chinese Communist Party as being 'bellicose' and 'pseudo-revolutionary', as 'refusing to oppose imperialism' and 'encouraging US imperialist aggression', and as being guilty of 'adventurism', 'splittism', 'Trotskyism', 'nationalism', 'great-power chauvinism', 'dogmatism', and so on and so forth. You have also been spreading rumours alleging that China 'is obstructing aid to Vietnam' and that 'China has been encroaching on Soviet territory'. You have gone so far as to state that 'China is not a socialist country'. These anti-Chinese activities all go to show that your present invitation is merely a gesture and is sent with ulterior motives. In these circumstances, how can the Chinese Communist Party which you look upon as an enemy be expected to attend your congress?

The Chinese Communist Party has attended many of the congresses of the CPSU. Also, we sent delegations to your 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses, after the Khrushchev revisionist group usurped the leadership of the CPSU. But at the 20th congress of the CPSU you suddenly lashed out at Stalin. Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist. In attacking Stalin you were attacking Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet Union, Communist Parties, China, the people and all the Marxist-Leninists of the world. At the 22nd congress, you adopted an out-and-out revisionist programme, made a wild public attack on Albania and reproached the Chinese Communist Party, so that the head of our delegation had to leave for home while the congress was only half way through.

Russia is the native land of Leninism and used to be the centre of the international working class movement. After Stalin's death, the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchev gradually revealed their true features as betrayers of Lenin and Leninism and embarked on the old path of the German Social Democrats Bernstein and Kautsky, who betrayed Marx and Engels and Marxism. As a result, the leadership of the CPSU has become the centre of modern revisionism.

Over the last ten years, we have made a series of efforts in the hope that you would return to the path of Marxism-Leninism. Since Khrushchev's downfall, we have advised the new leaders of the CPSU on a number of occasions to make a fresh start. We have done everything we could, but you have not shown the slightest repentance.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Since coming to power, the new leaders of the CPSU have gone farther and farther down the road of revisionism, splittism, and great-power chauvinism. The moment you came to power, you declared that you would resolutely carry out the Khrushchev revisionist general line of the 20th and 22nd congresses. You told us to our faces that there was not a shade of difference between Khrushchev and yourselves on the question of the international communist movement or of relations with China. Far from publicly retracting the anti-Chinese Open Letter of July 1963 and the anti-Chinese report and resolution of February 1964, you have intensified your activities against China by more insidious tactics. Despite the tricks you have been playing to deceive people, you are pursuing US-Soviet collaboration for the domination of the world with your whole heart and soul. In mouthing a few words against US imperialism and in making a show of supporting anti-imperialist struggles, you are conducting only minor attacks on US imperialism while rendering it major help. In following this tactic you very well know what you are up to, and so does US imperialism. Your clamour for 'united action', especially on the Vietnam question, is nothing but a trap for the purpose of deceiving the Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the world. You have all along been acting in coordination with the United States in its plot for peace talks, vainly attempting to sell out the struggle of the Vietnamese people against US aggression and for national salvation and to drag the Vietnam question into the orbit of Soviet-US collaboration. You have worked hand in glove with the United States in a whole series of dirty deals inside and outside the United Nations. In close coordination with the counter-revolutionary 'global strategy' of US imperialism, you are now actively trying to build a ring of encirclement around socialist China. Not only have you excluded yourselves from the international united front of all the peoples against US imperialism and its lackeys, you have even aligned yourselves with US imperialism, the main enemy of the people of the world, and the reactionaries of all countries in a vain attempt to establish a Holy Alliance against China, against the people, against the national liberation movement, and against the Marxist-Leninists.

Disregarding the opposition of many fraternal Parties, you convened the divisive Moscow meeting of March 1965. This was an extremely grave step to bring about an open split in the international communist movement. We demanded that you openly admit that the convening of the divisive Moscow meeting was wrong and illegal. Up to now you have not done so.

We would like to inform you explicitly that since you have gone so far, the Chinese Communist Party, as a serious Marxist-Leninist Party, cannot send its delegation to attend this congress of yours.

We are confident that in all parts of the world, including the Soviet Union, the masses of the people, who constitute over 90 per cent of the population, are for revolution and against imperialism and its

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lackeys. In the ranks of the international communist movement, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, over 90 per cent of the communists and cadres will eventually march along the path of Marxism-Leninism. The revolutionary people of the world, the great international communist movement, the great socialist camp, and the great peoples of China and the Soviet Union will eventually sweep away all obstacles and unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The Soviet people may rest assured that once the Soviet Union meets with imperialist aggression and puts up resolute resistance, China will definitely stand side by side with the Soviet Union and fight against the common enemy.

With fraternal greetings,

The Central Committee of
the Communist Party of China.

Communique of the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (excerpt). Adopted 12 August 1966

The Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee holds that the present situation as regards the struggle of Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people throughout the world against imperialism, reaction and modern revisionism is excellent. We are now in a new era of world revolution. All political forces are undergoing a process of great upheaval, great division, and great reorganisation. The revolutionary movement of the people in all countries, and particularly in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, is surging vigorously forward. Despite the inevitable zigzags and reversals in the development of the international situation, the general trend of imperialism heading for total collapse and socialism advancing to worldwide victory is unalterable. US imperialism and its lackeys in various countries cannot avert their doom by brutally suppressing and wildly attacking the masses of the revolutionary people, or by bribing and deceiving them. On the contrary, this only serves to give further impetus to the revolutionary awakening of all peoples. The activities of US imperialism and its stooges in various countries against the people and against revolution are giving impetus to the revolutionary activities of all peoples. US imperialism and its stooges in various countries appear to be powerful but are actually very weak. Taking the long view, they are all paper tigers.

The new leading group of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has inherited Khrushchev's mantle and is practising Khrushchev revisionism without Khrushchev. Their line is one of safeguarding imperialist and colonialist domination in the capitalist world and restoring capitalism in the socialist world. The leading group of the CPSU has betrayed Marxism-Leninism, betrayed the great Lenin, betrayed the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

road of the Great October Revolution, betrayed proletarian internationalism, betrayed the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat and of the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations, and betrayed the interests of the great Soviet people and the people of the socialist countries. They revile the Communist Party of China as being 'dogmatic', 'sectarian' and 'left adventurist'. In fact, what they are attacking is Marxism-Leninism itself. They are uniting with imperialism headed by the United States and the reactionaries of various countries and forming a new 'Holy Alliance' against communism, the people, revolution, and China. But this counter-revolutionary 'Holy Alliance' is doomed to bankruptcy and is already in the process of disintegration.

The Plenary Session holds that our Party's comprehensive public criticisms of Khrushchev revisionism over the last few years have been entirely correct and necessary. The Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement advanced by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on 14 June 1963 is a programmatic document. This document, drawn up under the personal leadership of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, and the nine comments by the Editorial Departments of *The People's Daily* and *Red Flag* on the open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the article 'A Comment on the March Moscow Meeting', Comrade Lin Piao's 'Long Live the Victory of People's War', etc., give scientific Marxist-Leninist analyses of a series of important questions concerning the world revolution of our time and are powerful ideological weapons against imperialism and modern revisionism.

The Plenary Session maintains that to oppose imperialism, it is imperative to oppose modern revisionism. There is no middle road whatsoever in the struggle between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. A clear line of demarcation must be drawn with respect to the modern revisionist groups whose centre is the leadership of the CPSU, and it is imperative resolutely to expose their true features as scabs. It is impossible to have 'united action' with them.

Concerning the Events in China (extracts)

Pravda, 27 November 1966

The events in China cause growing concern in the world communist movement, in the socialist countries, among progressives throughout the world. Reports on what is happening in China, as well as on the reaction of the world communist movement to the decisions of the 11th plenary meeting of the CC CPC, which approved the so-called 'cultural revolution' started on Mao Tse-tung's instructions, and the 'Red Guard' movement, have been and are being published in the press.

Not long ago the CPSU Central Committee published a statement giving an appraisal of these decisions. The events in China after the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

11th plenary meeting of the CC CPC make it necessary to revert to this matter again. . . .

The CC CPC meeting proclaimed struggle against 'three enemies'—'imperialism, world reaction, and modern revisionism'—as the main aim of China's foreign policy. It is evident further from the text that imperialism was mentioned there only for the sake of appearance. Under the guise of struggle against 'revisionists' all fire is concentrated on the CPSU and the Soviet Union, whose 'rout' is declared a prerequisite of struggle against imperialism. Simultaneously with this a line is openly pursued aimed at splitting the international communist and the entire liberation movement. The decisions of the plenary meeting abound in concoctions about our Party and its Central Committee which are insulting to the Soviet people. . . .

The CPSU and the Soviet state are the mainstay of the peoples in their resistance to the expansion of US imperialism, and the imperialists spearhead their struggle and their aggressive plans against the Soviet Union, but the authors of the Chinese documents go so far as to allege that our Party is 'uniting with US-led imperialism and the reactionaries of various countries and forming a new "Holy Alliance" against communism, the people, revolution, and China'. The CPC leaders need all these absurd concoctions about the struggle against 'modern revisionism' only to declare the CPSU and the Soviet Union 'enemy number one' against which they intend 'to struggle through to the end'. . . .

The forces that took the upper hand at the 11th plenary meeting openly declare the CPC's renunciation of the general line of the world communist movement and an intensified struggle against all communist parties consistently implementing this line in their activities. As distinct from the previous documents of the Communist Party of China, which at least paid lip-service to the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement, the decisions of the 11th plenary meeting do not even mention these documents. . . .

Contrary to the genuine interests of the struggle against US imperialism in Vietnam, the CPC leaders reject all proposals by communist and workers' parties aimed at strengthening international solidarity in defence of the Vietnamese people, in defence of the cause of revolution in the whole world. It is stressed in the decisions of the plenary meeting that any 'united action' with the CPSU and the other communist parties which come out for unity of action 'is impossible'. . . .

Maoism is now advanced in China as the official ideology underlying the entire policy of the Party and the country. 'The intensive study of Comrade Mao Tse-tung's works', a special section of the decision of the 11th plenary meeting says, 'by the whole Party and the whole nation is an important event of historic significance'.

The arrogant attempt of the Chinese leaders to proclaim Mao Tse-tung's views as the acme of Marxism-Leninism and to impose them on

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world communist movement cannot but evoke a legitimate protest by the communists the world over.

Mao Tse-tung's closest associate, Defence Minister Lin Piao, declared that 'Chairman Mao is much higher than Marx, Engels, Lenin . . .', and that his ideas are 'Marxism-Leninism at the highest level'. Lin Piao contended further that the study of the classics of Marxism-Leninism should consist 99 per cent in studying the writings of Mao Tse-tung. In actual fact, the 'mastering of theory' as such is reduced to studying 'Chairman Mao's works'.

Formerly Mao Tse-tung used to camouflage outwardly his personal participation in the struggle against the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties. Now, however, it is stressed that the anti-Leninist and anti-Soviet course has been worked out by Mao Tse-tung and the leaders in his retinue. . . .

Thus, the decisions of the 11th plenary meeting of the CPC Central Committee, which outwardly are devoted to questions of the so-called 'cultural revolution', actually involve cardinal problems of the CPC's policy in the international arena, the socialist community and the world communist movement.

The Chinese press does not conceal that the idea of its organisers is that the 'cultural revolution' should spread beyond the confines of the country. 'The cultural revolution', the Peking *People's Daily* writes, is 'a big cause involving the destinies of the Chinese people and, in a broader sense, the destinies of the peoples of the whole world'.

The events in China really do concern not only that country but also the entire world socialism, all communists—but not in the way Peking thinks. The fact that the entire policy of the CPC Central Committee is quite openly directed against the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, against the Soviet Union, against the CPSU and other communist parties, against the international unity of the ranks of the communist movement and the political line worked out by it, is bound to evoke legitimate alarm. . . .

It must be stressed that the CPC leaders are stubbornly seeking to aggravate relations with the Soviet Union, despite the tireless efforts of the CPSU and the Soviet government to normalise relations with the CPC and People's China. Our Party has displayed maximum patience, a profound and sincere desire to overcome the existing difficulties and differences and to strengthen unity of action with the Communist Party of China and the cohesion of the entire communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism. . . .

Immediately after the October [1964] plenary meeting of its Central Committee our Party advanced a broad programme of normalising Soviet-Chinese relations. But this programme was rejected by the CPC leaders. Another step aimed at improving the relations between the two parties and countries was taken by our side during the Soviet

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

delegation's meeting with the Chinese leadership in Peking in February 1965. But this meeting too was not crowned with success. . . .

On 28 November 1965 the CC CPSU sent a letter to the CC CPC which also contained a proposal to improve Soviet-Chinese relations. The CC CPC turned down this proposal as well. The Chinese leaders refused to send a delegation to the 23rd congress of the CPSU. Despite this, our Party declared at the congress that it was ready at any time to examine again the existing differences jointly with the CPC leadership in order to find ways of overcoming them on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The CPC Central Committee ignored the constructive proposals of our Party's congress and attacked its decisions.

A systematic anti-Soviet indoctrination of the population of China is now conducted on an unprecedented scale. Hostile demonstrations of the 'Red Guards' near the Soviet Embassy in Peking and sallies against Soviet people coming to China have become a system.

The Chinese leaders are trying to spread their anti-Soviet activities to the territory of our country. Dozens of radio stations are beaming unceasing hostile slanderous propaganda at the Soviet Union.

Steady curtailment of economic, scientific and technical cooperation with the Soviet Union is a practical result of the CPC leadership's anti-Soviet line. Trade has now become the only form of economic contacts between our countries. The Soviet Union's share in China's foreign trade dropped from 50 per cent in 1959 to 15 per cent in 1965. At the same time China's trade turnover with capitalist countries is growing from year to year. Soviet-Chinese cultural contacts have been reduced to a bare minimum as a result of the CPC leadership's hostile attitude.

Such are the facts. They irrefutably prove that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Central Committee have done everything possible to achieve a strengthening of the unity and cohesion of the CPSU and the CPC on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism, and a normalisation of relations between the USSR and China. The leadership of the Communist Party of China bears full responsibility for the failure to achieve success in this. . . .

The Chinese leadership is trying hard to smear the effective support and aid rendered by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to the Vietnamese people. Calling for a 'dissociation' from the CPSU and the other fraternal parties, the Chinese leaders demand, in effect, that the peoples waging a just struggle for national independence should renounce the aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist states and follow instructions from Peking.

The question arises: With whom, then, does the Chinese leadership, which is paying lip-service to the need for 'the broadest possible international united front' of struggle against US imperialism, want to unite if it rejects all proposals for joint action with those forces which are bearing the brunt of the struggle against imperialism? All this actually facilitates the escalation of the US aggression against the people of Vietnam.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The duplicity of the policy of the Chinese leaders is increasingly showing itself in the international arena. On the one hand, they are trying to impose on the fraternal parties a course that would lead to a continuous aggravation of the international situation and ultimately to war, allegedly in the name of world revolution. On the other hand, the Peking leaders pursue a line that would enable them to keep aloof from the struggle against imperialism.

While alleging that all contacts of the Soviet Union with the United States are a 'collusion' with imperialism, the Chinese leaders at the same time do not miss a chance to develop relations with capitalist countries, including the United States. As reported by the Japanese Kyodo Tsushin Agency, the Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs Chen Yi stated in a conversation with representatives of the Japanese Liberal-Democratic Party that in Warsaw Peking maintains contacts with Washington and 'does not necessarily rule out the idea of talks with the United States'. This is not the first time that Chen Yi makes statements of this kind. It is indicative that the western press constantly stresses that the noisy campaign against the United States conducted by Peking is a purely verbal 'escalation'. At the same time this press persistently elaborates on the subject of tensions on the Soviet-Chinese border in connection with China's territorial claims.

Many important events have occurred in the international arena since the announcement by the CPC Central Committee of its special platform. Life has more than once put to the test the correctness of the line worked out by the world communist movement at the Moscow Conferences in 1957 and 1960. The present course of the Chinese leaders has also been tested in practice. There can be no two opinions about the results of this test . . .

The repeated calls of the CPC leaders for 'organisational dissociation' from the Marxist-Leninist parties pursued the aim of creating a bloc of parties and groups with the CPC at the head. But the further events develop, the more obvious it becomes that they have nobody to league together with in the Communist movement. The pro-Chinese splinter groups, echoing ideas alien to the working class, were not destined to become in any way mass organisations and to win positions in the working-class movement of their countries. Conflicts have flared up lately in the splinter organisations and many of them are breaking up.

Equally unsuccessful were the Chinese leader's efforts to establish control over international democratic organisations—the World Council of Peace, the World Federation of Trade Unions, women's, youth and other organisations. Their attempts to turn these organisations into narrow and sectarian ones, to impose on them slogans and forms of activity entirely improper to them have met with failure.

The plans of the Chinese leadership with regard to the national-liberation movement have also failed. The big setbacks of Chinese

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy in the national-liberation movement and of those leaders who blindly supported it, seriously alarmed the progressive forces in the young national states, in revolutionary-democratic parties, and helped them to see the danger of the course suggested by the Peking leaders. As a result of this, instead of the hegemony sought by the CPC leaders in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, there is a sharp drop of China's prestige. . . .

The Chinese leaders' drive against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, their splitting activities in the communist movement, the failures in domestic and foreign policy, could not remain without consequences, and caused, as is admitted by the Chinese press, growing discontent among the Party cadres, intellectuals, in the army, and among the broad strata of the Chinese people.

In these conditions, instead of taking into account the opinion of the Party rank and file and changing their erroneous course, Mao Tse-tung and his group persisted in their policy, going to extremes. In Party activists, the cadres of the Party, they saw the main obstacle on this road . . .

Meeting with opposition to their course, Mao Tse-tung and his supporters did not stop at jeopardizing the leading role of the Party in the state. They want to turn the Communist Party from an organisation of like-minded people, politically conscious and principled fighters for realisation of the ideas of socialism, into an obedient, blind weapon to carry out the will of Mao Tse-tung. Those who try to fight for the principles of Marxism-Leninism, for the Leninist standards of inter-party life, are expelled from the Party . . .

In the past months, many Party committees of provinces, cities, industrial enterprises and higher educational establishments as well as editorial boards of central and provincial papers and magazines were 'reorganised' or dismissed. Party organisations are now often replaced by 'working groups' or 'committees of the cultural revolution'. A great number of Party and state functionaries, workers in science, literature and art have been branded as 'black bandits', 'right-wing elements' and 'revisionists'. And these labels are not only used to cover up the real meaning of the charges against them. As becomes evident from the Chinese press, what is involved here is above all the disagreement of many communists and workers in culture with the course pursued by Mao Tse-tung, a course whose grave consequences they realise full well.

It is noteworthy that people are subjected to repressions for the slightest expression of friendly feelings towards the Soviet Union.

To present the purge campaign as a mass movement originating from below, the so-called 'Red Guards'—the teenagers brought up in the atmosphere of unrestrained laudation of Mao Tse-tung, in the spirit of arbitrariness, nationalism, and anti-Sovietism—were drawn into this campaign. Behind them actually stand the leaders of the army and of state security organs.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The events in China are of a highly complex and contradictory nature. But it is evident already now that the nationalist, great-power course of Mao Tse-tung and his entourage gravely harms the people of China and jeopardises many gains of the revolution in the country, that it has seriously damaged the unity of the entire Communist movement, the cause of the struggle against imperialism. This cannot but deeply grieve and alarm those who hailed the great Chinese Revolution, who regarded it as their foremost duty to help the Chinese people in their struggle against imperialism and in socialist construction, who always strove for unity and friendship with the Chinese communists.

The interests of unity of all revolutionary forces in the struggle against imperialism demand that the nationalist, anti-Soviet policy and the attempts to distort Marxism-Leninism and replace it by the ideology and practice of Maoism be overcome.

On the International Policy of the USSR and the Struggle of the CPSU for the Cohesion of the Communist Movement

Decision of the Plenary Session of the CPSU Central Committee

Pravda, 14 December 1966

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee fully aproves the line and practical activities of the Political Bureau and the Soviet Government as regards relations between the CPSU and the Communist Party of China, between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. The latest developments in China and the decisions of the 11th Plenary Meeting of the CPC Central Committee show that the great-power, anti-Soviet policy of Mao Tse-tung and his group has entered a new, dangerous stage.

The course promoted by the present leaders of the CPC in the international arena; their policy in respect of socialist countries; the hostile campaign against our Party and the Soviet people, and the splitting activities in the international communist movement—all this has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. This policy and these actions damage the interests of socialism, the international working-class and liberation movements, the socialist gains of the Chinese people itself, and objectively assist imperialism.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee confirms the immutability of our Party's course of friendship and international solidarity with the Communist Party of China, with the People's Republic of China.

At the same time the Plenary Meeting finds it necessary to expose resolutely the anti-Leninist views and the great-power nationalistic

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

course of the present Chinese leaders, to step up the struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism and the general line worked out by the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960.

In the conditions now obtaining even greater importance is acquired by the struggle for the cohesion of all Communist and Workers' Parties on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The CPSU Central Committee expresses its agreement with the views of fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties that favourable conditions are now being created for a new international meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties which should be well prepared in the course of mutual consultations among the parties.

New Zig-Zags in the Chinese Cultural Revolution (extracts)

Pravda, 8 January 1967

The latest events taking place in China show that the master-minds behind the so-called 'cultural revolution' continue to 'inculcate Mao Tse-tung's ideas' in the country backed by the detachments of Red Guards, the army, and the State security agencies.

It will be recalled that last year Mao Tse-tung and his group concentrated the main blows at the Party *aktiv*, at Party cadres, regarding them as the main obstacle in the pursuit of their special course, both in domestic and in foreign policy. Many communists, workers who had passed through the great revolutionary school, and distinguished workers in culture and science, were defamed and were exposed to physical violence. Reports published by the Red Guards show that Chou En-lai at a recent meeting of soldiers of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, on behalf of Mao Tse-tung expressed gratitude to them for 'the good work they had done in the course of the great proletarian cultural revolution', and said that all this work was but a 'dress rehearsal'. How then is the further development of events to be seen if all that has taken place of late in China is regarded as a 'rehearsal'?

An increasing number of Party and Government officials, intellectuals, local aktivs at enterprises and in the communes, are now being persecuted. . . .

The Peking press now stresses the need to switch the 'cultural revolution' to industrial enterprises and to rural people's communes, and to set up Red Guard units there to counterbalance party committees and functioning state and economic agencies. Noteworthy in this context are reports on the dissolution of the All-China Federation of Labour on 27 December. The trade unions are accused of paying far too much attention to production, the conditions of the working people, and of 'disregarding Mao Tse-tung's ideas'. Materials circulated by

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Red Guards report that on the eve of the dissolution of the All-China Federation of Labour, the Red Guards were addressed by Chiang Ching, who declared that for seventeen years, since the victory of the revolution, the Federation had pursued a 'counter-revolutionary revisionist line', 'had not spread Mao Tse-tung's ideas among the workers', and 'had cast aside the revolutionary traditions of the working class movement in China, which were personally developed by Chairman Mao'.

Radio Discussion in Moscow

between Igor Belyayev and Fedor Burlatsky, of Pravda's editorial staff. Viktor Shrag in the chair (extracts)

22 January 1967

Burlatsky: . . . There are various notions about the present Chinese leadership. In particular, it seems to me that the Red Guards—whose ranks were after all mainly drawn from young people—have completely discredited themselves, especially by attacks on the Party and State apparatus. And now it is being emphasised that they have a wider basis —the so-called Great Cultural Revolution. Now these revolutionary insurgents have been set in motion. They are said to be demonstrating the start of a new stage of the Great Cultural Revolution.

Belyayev: . . . The point is that Mao Tse-tung and his group are now concerned with the creation of new governing organs to replace those that have existed so far. One of these governing organs is known as the 'People's Control Committee'. They first appeared in Shanghai after clashes between the workers and the Red Guards. An attempt to set up these People's Control Committees in Peking and other cities throughout the country is now being made. But, of course, it is not a question of people's control—this is mere demagogy—it is really a matter of replacing some Party and State workers who are largely inclined towards the opponents of Mao Tse-tung's line by others now being selected, who will be loyal and devoted to Mao Tse-tung and his group . . .

Shragin: Recent reports from Peking tell of mass arrests taking place in the country. . . . The second event that has attracted the attention of observers in Peking recently is the appearance on the streets of a large number of agitation brigades of servicemen. With the assistance of loud-speakers and leaflets they have been proclaiming that the Head of the Political Department of the People's Liberation Army is a conspirator and counter-revolutionary. On these grounds they are calling for his overthrow. Posters and leaflets are still being distributed attacking Chu Teh, member of the Politburo of the CCP Central Commitee

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress; former Marshal Ho Lung, and Chen Yun, both members of the Politbureau of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee and Deputy Premiers of the CPR State Council. On the posters which have been stuck up in many parts of the city you can see the photographs of twenty displaced leaders of the Chinese Communist Party and representatives of the intelligentsia. The photographs show them with their heads bowed or on their knees at meetings at which those present shout accusations against them . . .

Belyayev: What are the reasons for what is happening?

Burlatsky: We cannot at present, I think, give a full answer to this question because we do not have enough information. As you know, many of our correspondents have even been expelled from China. Nevertheless, we can already draw some conclusions. In the first place, we must say that we are grieved by what is happening in China; for this is a tragedy, both for the Chinese people and for the Chinese Communist Party, and it is also a severe trial for the entire world communist movement; but at the same time we may conclude that such a fierce struggle can only be explained by serious opposition to the political course which is being pursued by Mao Tse-tung and his group. If this political course and the schemes which are now being hatched by Mao Tse-tung and his group were not so monstrous—I am not afraid to use this word—it would be unlikely that this struggle would have been started at the top, against many members of China's Politbureau who have been marching with Mao Tse-tung for several decades . . .

It is well known that the Chinese Communist Party was created in 1921 and Mao Tse-tung was one of the twelve members at the first party congress. But for a long time he was not admitted to the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and was not elected to the Party's supreme organs. Why? Because the founders of the Chinese Communist Party regarded Mao Tse-tung as a man inclined towards the peasantry and contaminated with nationalist ideas.

Belyayev: . . . To speak more precisely, it was a question of a petty-bourgeois inclination which might deviate into the type of nationalism and chauvinism which we observe today.

Burlatsky: That is perfectly correct. What was his programme? His first idea was that it was necessary to create a revolutionary basis in the village from which to march to conquer the city and carry out the Chinese revolution by means of guerrilla warfare. His second idea was that one should have a critical approach to Marxism-Leninism, to the precepts of the Comintern and, as he said, to treat them as food, throwing away what was unpalatable and keeping what corresponded to China's national conditions. And his third idea was the creation of China's greatness. He used to say that the Chinese revolution would be the beginning of the history, not only of China, but also of the whole world.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was his luggage—and it must be said that at a particular stage some of his ideas, particularly the stressing of the very important part played by the peasants in carrying out the revolution, in fact played a positive part. But the further China moved towards socialism and the more acute questions of economic, social and cultural reform on socialist principles became, the more obvious became the mistakes of Mao Tse-tung, his erroneous ideological views, wrong tactical directives, and in particular his nationalism, which was inherent in him from the very beginning . . .

Belyayev: But the most recent events . . . are also connected with the failures in the fulfilment of plans laid down in the Chinese People's Republic, the people's communes and the 'Great Leap'. . . . One should also add the failures in the Chinese leadership's foreign policy, which is aimed at splitting the national liberation movement and isolating it from the socialist countries, and at splitting the communist and workers' movement with the aim of establishing the hegemony of the Chinese Communist Party in this movement. Or, more precisely, the Chinese leadership headed by Mao Tse-tung.

The Zig-Zags of the Cultural Revolution

Excerpts from a dispatch from Peking

Moscow Radio, 26 January 1967

The events of the last few days indicate that an unprecedented activisation of the forces which oppose Mao Tse-tung and his group is taking place in China at present. The happenings in Shanghai, Canton, Nanking, Sinkiang, Chungking and many other large towns testify to the great strength of the provincial and city committees of the Communist Party of China, which are rebuffing the attempts of the organisers of the cultural revolution to institute reprisals against all who think differently from them.

The local party committees are receiving the support of the overwhelming majority of the workers: even the press of the Red Guards has been forced to admit this, and has sounded a warning note because the workers are leaving the factories and going on strike. Work has stopped at many plants even in Peking, and the transport problem has become very acute throughout the country because of the strikes by railwaymen. Serious clashes between strikers and Red Guards have taken place in many parts of the country, and the working class is going on to the streets to announce its unwillingness to play the role of pawns in the present political campaign.

This turn of events certainly did not feature in the calculations of the Peking leaders of the cultural revolution. The central Chinese press, therefore, has started to appeal to the workers to return immediately to their places of work. The Peking leaders evidently consider that the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rights to the so-called revolutionary reconstruction can be enjoyed only by the Red Guards, that is to say, the green young people who, because of their political inexperience, accept unconditionally the ideas of Mao Tse-tung.

Behind the strident tone of the Chinese propaganda, asserting that the cultural revolution is gaining more and more victories, one perceives the striving of the Mao Tse-tung group to conceal the true situation in the country and in the Communist Party of China. For the second time recently there have been changes in the leadership of the propaganda department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

Leaflets circulated in Peking report the arrest of dozens of military people, accused of opposing the line of Mao Tse-tung. It became known from these leaflets that arrests are being made amongst the army's officer corps. The arrested officers were recently led publicly through the streets of Peking hanging their heads. In this way, the cultural revolution has served in the army, too, as a screen for reprisals against those who do not agree with the present course of Mao Tse-tung and those surrounding him.

The leaders of the political campaign which continues in China are leaning more and more towards the harsh suppression of opposition. From the placards which have appeared over the last week in Peking, it seems that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has worked out draft rules, under which the organs of public security will immediately arrest all persons who dare to oppose Mao Tse-tung.

Taking everything into consideration, the leaders of the so-called cultural revolution intend to continue it with the aid of the Red Guards, behind whom stand the army and the forces of public security.

The Situation in China Grows Worse (extracts)

Pravda, 28 January 1967

The Chinese press says that a ' new leap forward in the cultural revolution ', connected with ' the struggle to seize power ', has been launched at Chairman Mao's call.

The magazine *Red Flag* says that Mao Tse-tung personally ordered that ' an appeal to all Shanghai people ' and ' an emergency notification ' which was to lead to a ' new leap forward ' in the ' Cultural Revolution ', should be broadcast on the radio. The appeal and notification were published under the signature of Red Guards after they had launched a sweeping attack on Shanghai party organisations and workers supporting them. Shanghai workers came out against the Red Guard outrages committed under the flag of the ' Cultural Revolution ' and against a policy which is hitting directly at the vital interests of the working people. Another offensive against Party and State agencies, trade unions and those whom Mao Tse-tung and his group regard as opponents of their

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-popular course, has been launched under the slogan of combating so-called 'economism'.

What is the meaning of the term 'economism'? Statements in the Chinese newspapers which support Mao Tse-tung's line show that 'economism' is the term applied to the efforts made by some Party workers, particularly in Shanghai, to improve at least a little the difficult material conditions of the Chinese workers and peasants. Such tendencies are now regarded in Peking as the gravest crime. *The People's Daily* and *Red Flag* declare that 'economism' encourages 'material stimulation' and 'indulges the backward masses'. It should be recalled that in the course of the past decade the wages of Chinese workers, far from rising, have actually dropped considerably.

The New China News Agency declares that the Chinese workers need no money, that they 'think of Mao Tse-tung day and night'. Chinese propaganda persistently declares that concern for the personal interests of the working people is a manifestation of 'Soviet revisionism' and is incompatible with the interests of society and socialist revolution.

The People's Daily reports that in Shanghai the 'leftists', operating under the 'banner of Mao Tse-tung's ideas', have seized 'political, economic, and cultural power'. It even carries a report that on 12 January at night the 'leftists' following Mao Tse-tung's line took control of committees of the Chinese Communist Party and people's committees in Shansi Province and the city of Taiyuan. It is pointed out that 'at the critical moment of the struggle for power', military units helped the 'leftists'. Several days ago, a poster put up by NCNA staff members in Peking said that Mao Tse-tung had instructed Lin Piao to use the army to support the 'leftists' and put an end to the sham 'non-interference' of the army in the affairs of the 'cultural revolution'. Now the army newspaper has bluntly stated in an editorial that the People's Liberation Army must resolutely support and help the so-called 'leftists' and that this was 'Mao's great call'. This article was reprinted by the *People's Daily*, which points out that the actions of the forces of the Shansi garrison who helped the Red Guards to seize power in that province should serve as a model for the whole army.

Nation-wide Condemnation of Soviet Revisionists' Atrocities against Chinese Students

New China News Agency, Peking, 29 January 1967

Revolutionary masses throughout China expressed boundless indignation at the Soviet revisionists' vicious atrocities against Chinese students.

In all the major cities, revolutionary rebel workers, peasants, students, and cadres have held meetings and demonstrations to condemn the Soviet modern revisionists.

In Tientsin, Kwangchow, Chengtu, Sian, Wuhan, and in the capitals of many autonomous regions including Tibet, Inner Mongolia, Sinkiang,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Kwangsi, Red Guards and other revolutionary rebels have put up huge posters in the streets to express their indignation at this outrage.

At rallies and demonstrations and in their posters, revolutionary people in various parts of the country pointed out that this bloody Moscow attack is an indication of the fear the Soviet revisionist scoundrels have for revolutionary people, for Mao Tse-tung's thought, and for the great proletarian cultural revolution now under way in China.

The demonstrators declared that this fascist outrage was a frenzied provocation towards the 700 million Chinese people but it would only serve to bring about the ignominious downfall of the modern revisionists.

Revolutionary people throughout China proclaimed that China's great cultural revolution is sounding the death knell for the wretched Soviet revisionists and that their days are numbered.

They stated their belief that the dark cloud hanging over the Soviet Union will ultimately be dispelled; in Lenin's homeland the great red banner of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, will fly again, and that the glorious Soviet revolutionary people will rebuild a new Soviet Union under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Demonstrators in the northern industrial city of Tientsin warned that the Chinese people, armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought, are not to be trifled with. 'We will break their necks if they dare to continue their hostile activities towards the revolutionary people of the world', they thundered.

In many statements of condemnation issued by the Red Guards of the city, the young revolutionary fighters pointed out that it was not accidental that the Moscow outrage should have occurred at a time when China's cultural revolution was entering a new stage marked by the seizure of power by the revolutionary rebels. 'This is because the Soviet revisionist scoundrels with Brezhnev and Kosygin as their ringleaders are afraid that the Soviet people might rise in rebellion, because they are afraid of Mao Tse-tung's thought and the influence of China's cultural revolution on the Soviet people,' the Red Guards declared.

More than 20,000 people held a demonstration rally in Kwangchow. Huge streamers around the meeting place read: 'Down with Brezhnev!' 'Down with Kosygin!'

Speakers at the rally expressed their determination to carry through to the end the great cultural revolution by holding high the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought. They said that the shattering attacks on the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the bourgeois reactionary die-hards were also heavy blows at the Soviet revisionists and a great support to the world revolution.

In the northwest China city of Sian, revolutionary rebels used loudspeakers to proclaim: 'We red rebels armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought fear nothing at all in the world. We made up our minds a long time ago to continue our rebellion against imperialism and the Soviet revisionists till the birth of a glorious communist world.'

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A spokesman at the general headquarters of the revolutionary rebels of the former poor and lower-middle peasants of Chengtu, Szechwan province, said that the Soviet revisionist scoundrels' attempt to resist the influence of China's great cultural revolution was only a daydream. He believed that some day the Soviet people would rise in rebellion to overthrow the revisionist leading clique and rebuild a state of the genuine dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the triple city of Wuhan on the Yangtse, a revolutionary rebel of the 'Mao Tse-tung's thought red artist army' told reporters: 'Troops and police cannot suppress the truth and criminal hands cannot blot out the sunshine. The heroic Soviet people will rise to their feet one day to crush Brezhnev and Kosygin and their like.'

In Lhasa, thousands of revolutionary rebels of different nationalities demonstrated yesterday to show their anger at the Moscow outrage. They pledged themselves to emulate the revolutionary spirit of the Chinese students who faced the Soviet revisionists' atrocities heroically. Tibetan revolutionary rebels declared their resolve to carry the great cultural revolution through to the end so that the very roots of capitalism and revisionism would be dug out.

Demonstrators in Urumchi, capital of the Sinkiang Uigur autonomous region, pledged themselves to make Sinkiang a strong fortress in the fight against Soviet modern revisionism.

At the Soviet Embassy in Peking (extracts)

New China News Agency, 2 February 1967

The Chinese staff working in the Soviet embassy in China declared a three-day strike on 27 January in protest against the Soviet revisionist leading clique for the beating up of Chinese students on the Red Square in Moscow while they were en route home from Europe.

The Chinese staff were extremely angry to learn on 30 January that diplomatic officials of the Soviet embassy in Iraq had beaten up Chinese students studying there. They unanimously decided to prolong the strike for another three days to express their very strong protest.

At nine o'clock on 2 February the entire Chinese staff went back to work in the Soviet embassy in China, but the representative of the embassy unreasonably refused to allow them to return and stated that they would be dismissed. The Chinese staff members immediately pointed out that this action ignored the Constitution and the Labour Insurance regulations of the People's Republic of China. This was an act of political retaliation and therefore they refused to accept it.

Tass Report, 3 February 1967

The witches' sabbath of the Red Guards and 'rebels' outside the Soviet embassy in Peking is assuming savage forms. Powerful loud-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speakers blare forth violent abuse and bloodthirsty calls for revenge on the Soviet people. Never before in all the history of the Soviet state has such an unbridled anti-Soviet campaign been conducted in any country, even in one most hostile to the Soviet Union.

At the same time, the Chinese authorities have stepped up direct provocations against Soviet diplomatists who have to go on business into the city. A group of Soviet diplomatists and officials of other Soviet institutions in Peking, who were detained near the Chinese Airlines building at about 11.00 yesterday, were released only at about 03.00 today, after vigorous protests by the Soviet side. They were subjected to insults, blackmail, and threats for 16 hours, and some of them were manhandled. Soviet embassy cars were mutilated beyond recognition. But the attempts to provoke or intimidate the Soviet citizens failed.

One more act, staged by the Chinese authorities to keep up with anti-Soviet hysteria, was the 'festive' welcome given in Peking to nine participants in the provocation in Moscow's Red Square, who arrived there by air, and also to 49 Chinese students from other countries.

In his speech at the airport, Chen Yi, Vice-Premier of the State Council and Foreign Minister, extolled the 'revolutionary services' of the hooligans.

Western news agencies, quoting information received from the NCNA correspondent in Moscow, allege that Soviet police tore down a display case with anti-Soviet exhibits from the wall of the Chinese embassy in Moscow and manhandled Chinese diplomatists who wanted to interfere.

According to trustworthy information available to Tass what actually happened was that numerous letters were received from Soviet working people protesting at the slanderous nature of the material in a display case outside the building of the Chinese embassy in Moscow; that because of this the Chinese embassy were asked to remove these hostile materials and photographs and to desist from anti-Soviet propaganda; that the Chinese embassy ignored these warnings; and that Soviet citizens had then themselves removed the slanderous materials exhibited in the display case. There was of course no manhandling of Chinese diplomatists as alleged by representatives of the Chinese embassy and NCNA. These allegations are pure slander and provocation from beginning to end.

Tass Report, 4 February 1967

The siege of the Soviet embassy in Peking by rampaging Red Guards and 'rebels' and provocations against Soviet citizens continue unabated.

A provocation was staged yesterday by former Chinese employees of the Soviet embassy in Peking. After being dismissed (in complete accordance with Chinese laws) for calling a 'strike' in an attempt to disrupt the embassy's normal work, they went to the Soviet consulate,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ostensibly to lodge a 'protest', but actually they started a row in an attempt to provoke the consular staff. They forced their way into the building and practically occupied the premises by force, insulting the head of the consular department and hampering normal work. The former Chinese employees of the Soviet embassy refused to leave the consulate building and are staying there in shifts. The Chinese Foreign Ministry ignored the embassy's demand for measures to remove them from the consulate. What is more, the Foreign Ministry gave full support to the hooligans, while a spokesman for the Diplomatic Corps Service Bureau even demanded that 'the embassy gates be opened to Chinese citizens'.

The same day, 3 February, Red Guards attacked a bus which was taking three members of the embassy staff and of the State Committee for Economic Assistance and six Soviet specialists returning from Vietnam. The crowd of several thousand Red Guards blocked the road, wrested the ignition key from the driver, and slashed the tyres. The Red Guards were in a frenzy for three hours. They insulted the Soviet people, spat at them and splashed them with glue. They demanded that the Soviet citizens leave the bus and tried to lynch them.

At the Chinese Embassy in Moscow

New China News Agency, 5 February 1967

Comrade Chou En-lai and Comrade Yi today sent a telegram expressing solicitous regards to all the comrades-in-arms of the Chinese embassy in Moscow. The message reads in full as follows:

Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the Soviet Union
Dear comrades-in-arms of the Chinese embassy in the Soviet Union,

We extend heartfelt regards to you, heroic fighters against revisionism, on behalf of the greatest leader Chairman Mao Tse-tung and his close comrade-in-arms Comrade Lin-piao and of the central committee of the party, the State Council, the military commission of the party's central committee and the cultural revolution group under the party's central committee.

Holding aloft the great red banner of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, you have carried out tit-for-tat struggles against the Soviet revisionist leading clique in Moscow, the centre of its rule. When hooligans wildly raided our embassy under the direction of the Soviet revisionist leading clique, you stepped forward and, in defiance of tyranny and at the risk of your life, defended with blood the dignity of our great socialist motherland under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and you have thus stood a severe test in international class struggle. You are models in creatively studying and applying Chairman Mao Tse-tung's works. You are worthy red diplomatic working personnel, loyal to Chairman Mao and to Mao Tse-tung's thought. You have

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lived up to what the 700 million people expect of you. All the diplomatic working personnel should learn from you.

We extend to you the militant salute of the great proletarian cultural revolution!

Peking,
5 February 1967

Chou En-lai
Chen Yi

New China News Agency, 9 February 1967

INSTIGATED again by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique, a group of hooligans disguised as 'worker representatives' created another disturbance at the Chinese Embassy in Moscow yesterday. From two thirty to five o'clock the hooligans shouted anti-China slogans and viciously abused Chairman Mao, the greatest leader of the Chinese people. In two cars installed with loudspeakers, several 'factory representatives' blared out anti-China resolutions 'adopted' at their rigged-up anti-China meetings. A Soviet major-general and two colonels walked to and fro in front of the Chinese Embassy. At the same time hooligans organized in groups broke into the front compound of the Embassy and shouted that they wanted to hand 'messages of protest' to the chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Chinese Embassy.

Early in the morning, the comrades of the Embassy had indignantly taken down the anti-China placards stuck on the fence by the hooligans within the front compound of the Embassy on the afternoon of the previous day, and they ripped them to pieces. Now, the 'worker representatives' again put up anti-China placards on the fence; but later they removed them to the snow-drifts outside the fence at the ending of the trouble-making incident.

The Chinese Embassy in Moscow lodged a strong protest with the Far East department of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs against this new provocation. In the past few days, the Soviet revisionist authorities have repeatedly committed anti-China crimes which have aroused the indignation of the Soviet people. In spite of the presence of policemen, a Soviet woman risked her life to rub out three anti-China slogans traced on the snow-covered grounds in front of the Chinese Embassy by the hooligans under the instigation of the Soviet revisionist authorities.

On the Anti-Soviet policy of Mao Tse-tung and his Group

Pravda, 16 February 1967

DURING the past half century our party and our people have had to withstand more than once vehement attacks of hostile forces on

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first socialist state in the history of mankind. But if we omit the periods of war, the periods of direct armed agression against the Soviet Union, it will be possible to say that never before has such a fierce campaign been conducted against it as the one launched by the present leaders of China . . . The Mao Tse-tung group openly steered a course of systematically thwarting the steps taken by the Soviet Union in the international arena together with other socialist nations to safeguard the interests of world socialism, the revolutionary movement, universal peace, a course of splitting the communist and liberation movements and the international democratic organizations. Furthermore, Peking began to make ever more persistent attempts to conduct subversive activity against the socialist countries and the communist parties, interfering in their internal affairs, and organizing splinter groups in several parties.

The time has long passed when the policy of Mao Tse-tung's group could seem to be an expression of ideological differences, discussions within the framework of the communist movement. Not limiting itself to attacks on the line of the CPSU and of the other fraternal parties, this group went over to open political struggle against our country, against our party and our people ... It maliciously distorts every step of the Soviet Government on the international scene, every step dictated by concern for the interests of peace and socialism. The press and broadcasting stations of China are going out of their way to fling mud at our people and their party. Furthermore, Chinese propaganda has been calling on the Soviet people for many months now to overthrow the existing system, to hoist the 'banner of Mao Tse-tung in Red Square,' to establish in the USSR a 'new order' modelled after the one that is now being set up by Mao Tse-tung in China. The campaign is not limited, however, to mendacious propaganda which, in its tone and its filthy methods, exceeds everything, perhaps, that the enemies of our party and of our people have ever dared to say. The Chinese leadership has embarked upon the road of direct anti-Soviet actions and provocations. The Soviet Embassy in Peking has become their permanent target. A new outrage was recently organized at its walls, which lasted for more than two weeks and created absolutely intolerable conditions for the work of the Embassy staff.

THE Chinese authorities go to such lengths in their shameless violations of the existing norms and customs of international law as even the most reactionary imperialist governments have rarely permitted themselves. At present the 'geography' of such provocations has been considerably expanded. Mao Tse-tung and his entourage are obviously endeavouring to carry out their adventurist threat to transfer Red Guard methods of political hooliganism to the international arena . . . The whole Chinese propaganda machine is today concentrated on this goal. It incites passions daily by tales about 'unprecedented atrocities' allegedly staged against Chinese citizens in Moscow, engages in direct instigation of crowds of youngsters by advancing the slogan 'blood for

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blood,' threatening to demand 'payment of the blood debt' . . . Many people all over the world, who are following the anti-Soviet campaign launched by the Chinese leaders, just cannot take in the fact that its organizers and inspirers are this time not imperialists or a capitalist state, but politicians who call themselves communists. This fact is really amazing and can hardly be grasped. It is therefore all the more important to disentangle the reasons for this monstrous Peking paradox. What are the organizers of the campaign of hatred towards the Soviet Union striving to achieve? Facts show that the people who direct the policy of China today set before themselves the goal not only of bringing up the Chinese people in a spirit of enmity towards the USSR, but also of aggravating Soviet-Chinese relations to the limit, and, in the final count, of bringing them to a complete break.

However, fearing responsibility for the consequences of this step, they do not dare act openly, and are striving to provoke the Soviet Union into rupturing these relations in order to deceive world public opinion . . . Another question arises in this connection: why does the Mao Tse-tung group need this aggravation and what goals is it pursuing? The answer to this question must be sought in the whole nationalistic, great-power policy of the present Chinese leadership . . . There can also be no doubt about the fact that one of the direct reasons for the anti-Soviet policy and propaganda of the present Chinese leadership is the desire to divert the attention of the Chinese people from the privations and difficulties they are experiencing, from the numerous mistakes and failures in the domestic and foreign policy of China. Here we are actually confronted with the old, hackneyed method of all unprincipled politicians suffering bankruptcy. If matters grow worse and worse, if one of their political moves after another ends in a fiasco, such people see the only way out in putting the blame for all their misfortunes on the 'enemies', both 'domestic' and, especially, 'external'. This is precisely the principle used today by the Peking leaders.

IT is by no means accidental that they fired their first shots in the political war against the Soviet State and the CPSU shortly after the failure of the ill-starred 'big leap' and 'people's communes' course. As the scope of setbacks in domestic policy and the failure of the foreign policy line pursued by the CPC leadership, which led the country to isolation, became clearer, the anti-Soviet campaign grew more and more intense. The farther it departed from the principles of scientific socialism, the louder and more persistently did Peking propaganda allege that it was the Soviet Union that was departing from them, that our country 'betrays the interests of the revolution', and is 'restoring capitalism'. Soon Chinese propaganda began to ring of pure nationalism and even racialism. By advancing territorial claims against the Soviet Union, the leadership of the CPC set before itself the goal of inciting still further the chauvinistic mood of the Chinese people.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The slanderous propaganda began to be augmented more and more extensively by various anti-Soviet sorties and provocations. By persuading the Chinese people by every possible means that they are surrounded on all sides by enemies, the Peking rulers are striving to rally them on nationalistic lines, to divert the masses of the working people from the actual problems confronting the country, and to justify the military-bureaucratic dictatorship of Mao Tse-tung and his henchmen . . . It is obvious that as a result of Mao Tse-tung's economic ventures the Chinese leadership had, in effect, to give up plans for China's economic development, to give up the building of the material and technical base of socialism, and to openly renounce the policy of raising the living standards of the working people. In these circumstances the Peking rulers found nothing better than to try to turn need into virtue by proclaiming economic development and concern for improving the people's life as something 'anti-socialist' and 'bourgeois'.

In the field of theory they had little trouble substantiating this idea by firing against Marxist-Leninist science another broadside of Mao Tse-tung's quotations: 'in production to strive for high indices and in life to keep to a low level', 'poverty is good', 'it is terrible to think of the time when all people will be rich', etc. But since the practice of world socialism fully contradicts such directives and notions of socialism, the Chinese leaders have started a slander campaign against the USSR and other socialist countries, describing their struggle for economic progress, for raising the living and cultural standards of the people, as 'revisionism', 'economism' and even 'restoration of capitalism'. For the bigger the economic successes of the Soviet Union, the better the life of the Soviet people, the greater is the fear of Mao Tse-tung and his group for the destinies of their special line, the bigger the opposition to this line in China itself . . .

The entire practice of the CPSU and the other communist parties, which are consistently developing the Leninist intra-party norms, strengthening principles of collective leadership, and adhering strictly to democratic principles in the activities of all party organisations from top to bottom, naturally creates a danger to Mao Tse-tung and his power. For Mao Tse-tung's group has long been attacking its own party. The most elementary norms and principles of inner party life—electivity of party bodies, responsibility of leaders to the party and party organisations, publicity in the discussion of the party line, etc., have been trampled underfoot in China. Mao Tse-tung's personality cult has reached the absurd, has become real idolatry. The routing of party organisations, the hounding and annihilation of party cadres is in full swing under the flag of the 'cultural revolution', and is being carried out by detachments of Mao Tse-tung's storm troopers with the support of the army and security service. In order to justify all this and in order to muzzle the Chinese communists who cannot but compare the things happening in China with the practice of other communist parties, the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mao Tse-tung group had to smear the CPSU's Leninist line and to level the absurd charge of 'revisionism' against it . . .

THE history of the working class movement demonstrates that renegades from Marxism have always shown blind hatred for the banner which they had betrayed. The Mao Tse-tung group is not an exception in this respect. One of the main tasks of the anti-Soviet hysteria it is now fanning is to fence the Chinese people off from genuine Marxism-Leninism, from the experience of world socialism. In the present conditions this experience is not only alien to the Chinese leaders but is dangerous to them, because knowledge of this experience would only show the communist party and people of China how far their leaders had departed from the interests of the revolution and socialism. That is why the Chinese leadership had to isolate their country, to erect a 'Chinese wall' to keep their people away from the socialist community, from the entire progressive world public . . . Mao Tse-tung's erroneous policy has led the country into an impasse. Seeing no way out, the Chinese leadership rushes from one adventure to another. Its anti-Sovietism is precisely one such adventure.

The anti-Soviet campaign of the Chinese leaders is conducted in the most outrageous, genuinely hooliganistic forms. But this seeming offensiveness should not delude anyone. In effect, the actions of Mao Tse-tung's group are motivated not by their strength but by their weakness, by their fear of their own party and their own people. The latest events show that the Peking leaders have sufficient grounds for such a fear. The 'cultural revolution' has brought to light the great scope of the dissatisfaction of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, a dissatisfaction that has spread even to the army and the youth on which Mao Tse-tung's group is depending. The events which had started under the flag of the 'cultural revolution' have actually developed into a fierce struggle to retain power by Mao Tse-tung and his followers. Their policy shows that for the sake of power they are ready to sacrifice everything—the interests of socialism, the interests of their people and the interests of the revolution . . . Hatred for the Soviet Union has always been common ground that united enemies of socialism, and it is not fortuitious that interest in China has grown so much among imperialist reactionary quarters, where the prospects and possibilities of rapprochement with that country are being discussed with growing attention.

Many facts show that these intentions meet a response from Mao Tse-tung's group. A re-orientation of China's economic ties has been going on for several years, switching from the socialist world to the capitalist one. Peking's political contacts with imperialist powers, including the United States, too, are becoming increasingly more frequent and regular.

But the main thing is that already today Mao Tse-tung and his supporters are by their policy rendering invaluable services to the imperialists. This group has actually replaced struggle against imperialism by

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the struggle against the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries, and against the communist movement. Thereby it weakens the front of anti-imperialist forces and aggravates the entire political situation in Asia. All this inflicts a stab in the back above all of the heroic Vietnamese people in its struggle against the American aggressors. Imperialist quarters fully approve of this line of Mao Tse-tung's group. The *Washington Post* wrote that officials in Washington believe that Mao serves American interests and therefore even think of cultivating Maoism as a means of putting pressure on Moscow. The *US News and World Report* magazine actually wrote in this connection that the United States is relying on Mao and that American officials are more prone to prefer Mao Tse-tung's victory in his struggle to destroy more moderate elements because this would mean more trouble for Soviet Russia. Such is the reaction of imperialist circles to Mao Tse-tung's policy, which is advertised by Peking propaganda as the latest in 'revolutionism'. Such praise by the class enemy is yet another proof of the extent to which the domestic and foreign policy of Mao Tse-tung and his group contradicts the interests of socialism, the interests of the revolution, and plays into the hands of imperialism, first of all the imperialism of the United States . . . These days the hearts of the Soviet people are full of wrath and just indignation. Firm words of warning addressed to the Chinese provocateurs sound at numerous meetings in the towns and villages. The Soviet people unanimously support the position of their government outlined in the statements of February 4 and 9, containing a principled appraisal of the latest actions of the Chinese authorities.

INSISTING on its anti-Soviet policy, Mao Tse-tung's group will only further disclose the depth of its degradation, and show the degree of its political degeneration. The international isolation of Mao Tse-tung's group is increasing virtually every day. The world communist movement and upright people in all countries are more and more indignant over Peking's adventurist course and its anti-Soviet position. There is no doubt that Mao Tse-tung's group will not be able to deceive the Chinese people and Chinese communists for ever. As correctly stated by Moscow workers in their protest resolution presented to the Chinese Embassy in Moscow, 'Mao Tse-tung and his clique will have to give full account to the Chinese people and the Chinese communists, to the whole of progressive mankind, for their shameful, criminal actions aimed at undermining the friendship of the Chinese and Soviet peoples.' The entire international communist movement now asks itself the question: where will Mao Tse-tung's group move? Everything shows that it is preparing the Chinese People's Republic for further adventurist actions in the field of both domestic and foreign policy, not excluding also new provocations against the Soviet Union.

Having replaced the struggle against imperialism by the struggle against the Soviet Union, against the entire socialist community, against

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the international communist and liberation movements, Mao Tse-tung's group is inflicting considerable damage on the cause of world socialism, including the Chinese people and the cause of building up socialism in China. The anti-Leninist adventurist policy of this group holds in store for the Chinese people only a further aggravation of economic difficulties, a lowering of living standards, a worsening international situation and the prospect of China's complete isolation from the socialist community. But the Chinese people, the Chinese People's Republic and the Chinese Communist Party have, objectively, another prospect also. This is the prospect of improving relations with the CPSU and the Soviet Union, with all socialist countries and communist parties, the prospect of joint struggle in the ranks of the socialist community against imperialism, the prospect of economic development and rectifying previous errors in the field of agriculture and industry, and the raising on this basis of the people's living standards, the prospect of asserting Marxist-Leninist norms in the life of the Chinese Communist Party and the establishment of socialist legality in the Chinese People's Republic. In other words, the prospect of developing along the road outlined by the eighth congress of the Communist Party of China, by documents of the international conferences of communist and workers' parties. This Marxist-Leninist prospect meets the cardinal interests of the Chinese people, People's China and the Chinese Communist Party. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the entire Soviet people, want precisely this prospect to emerge victorious, want the Chinese People's Republic to advance along this correct road.

New Tactics of the Mao Tse-tung Group

Tass report from Peking
5 March 1967

It is clear that it is not a small group of people who are opposed to the line of Mao Tse-tung, but the majority of the population. It is precisely this which largely explains why the Mao Tse-tung group is now obliged to change its previous tactics in the present political campaign. These new tactics are, above all, marked by an attempt to offer a bait to all those whom the assault of the Red Guards and the rebels has not managed to vanquish. Instead of the old slogan of firing at the headquarters, a diametrically opposite call was made that consideration should be shown to the leadership. The Peking strategists, who only yesterday were fanning anarchy, today condemn it. The Mao Tse-tung group advises its partisans not to resort to violence against those who think differently but to confine themselves to political struggle.

All this cannot but be interpreted as an admission that the frontal attack of the Mao Tse-tung group on its opponents, which was designed to finish them off, has failed. So now in Peking they are

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carrying out a turning manoeuvre. The aim of all this remains, of course, unchanged. After all, the principal slogan of the present political campaign, the slogan of seizure of power, has not been struck off the list.

Nor is the international success of this purely tactical move of minor importance. By pretending that the country does its best to restrain the Red Guards and the rebels, the Mao Tse-tung group, which is guilty of having unleashed terror and coercion in the country, hopes to hide from world public opinion the true face of the so-called 'cultural revolution'. It is, therefore, not by chance that the Peking authorities categorically forbid foreign journalists to visit, even in the Chinese capital, those places where the 'revolution', as one regrets to have to call it, is taking place. Despite the loud appeals of the Mao Tse-tung group to limit the struggle to political issues, physical reprisals continue in China against people who are objectionable to the Peking leaders. The latest issues of provincial newspapers clearly show this. They are publishing numerous photographs depicting the scenes of humiliating abuse and insults to which Mao Tse-tung's opponents are subjected.

The organisers of the campaign of terror and coercion in China greatly hope that in March and April they will succeed in overcoming the resistance in the countryside and in establishing there the rule of the Mao Tse-tung group. Time will show whether they will manage to achieve this goal, towards which they have been striving without success since last summer, within this period. However, one can now say already that the continuation of the famous 'cultural revolution' will be likely to bring about even greater political confusion in China.

Extract from a speech by Brezhnev

Pravda, 11 March 1967

The 'take-over of power' announced by Mao Tse-tung is meeting with strong opposition from the population in many places and is not infrequently accompanied by bloodshed. The frontal attack by Red Guards and rebels on the party and government bodies at the centre and in the provinces has encountered serious resistance. To all appearances, the resistance has been stronger than Mao Tse-tung expected. Political chaos and economic disorganisation in China have obviously assumed such proportions that Peking is having to manoeuvre and change its tactics. In the last few days there has suddenly been talk of the necessity of a 'correct attitude to officials', and at least lip service has been paid to condemnation of the crudest forms of intervention by Red Guards in the activity of enterprises and state institutions. Many opponents of Mao Tse-tung are even promised 'forgiveness' and are included in the new agencies of power. These tactical stratagems of the Mao Tse-tung group are clear evidence that it is aware of the weakness of its position, but, of course, they change nothing in the anti-revolutionary character of its policy.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INSIDE CHINA: EYEWITNESSES

China this autumn (extracts)

L. Andronov

New Times (Moscow), 30 November, 14 December 1966

I could hardly recognise Peking when I visited it this October with a group of Soviet tourists, though I'd seen it only three months before. It was as if its streets and squares had donned carnival masks. House walls, poles, stalls and even the pavements were covered with multi-coloured hieroglyphs—spelling out salutations to Mao Tse-tung and the 'cultural revolution', or imprecations and threats against well-known party and government leaders. The streets were thronged with so-called 'Red Guards'—boys and girls in blue or green uniforms with red armbands. More than two million of them had been brought into the Chinese capital and they roamed its streets all day long, filling all the markets and shops, crowding the buses, blocking all the doors to the state offices and institutions against which they had been ordered to open 'hurricane fire'. The faces of most of the teen-age 'revolutionaries' glowed with pleasure. And no wonder: instead of having to go to school they were having the time of their lives riding about the country, living and eating at state expense and—most fun of all—wrecking Party committee offices and ministries on orders from above.

There are today about ten million 'Red Guards' riding about from one city to another. Thirty per cent of the country's transport facilities have been placed at their disposal. Trains carrying 'Red Guards' are invariably given the right of way, all others generally run far behind their schedules.

Though the South of China has been hit by drought and crop failure, in other parts of the country autumn has brought good harvests, but, as the Chinese press admits, the transportation of produce is hindered by a shortage of transport facilities. In Peking the railway stations are crammed with 'Red Guards' and the streets clogged with thousands of out-of-town buses bringing in fresh loads of them. Their drivers, being unacquainted with the city, create one traffic jam after another. Besides, the names of many streets have been changed in the course of the 'cultural revolution', the old signs have been taken down or pasted over with paper and no new signs put up—which goes to make confusion worse confounded.

Meanwhile the cold weather brought by autumn winds is already making itself felt. Deputy Premier Tao Chu reported 100,000 'Red Guards' ill in Peking on October 24. There is danger of an epidemic. Hundreds of cesspools have been dug in the central streets as temporary toilets. They are screened off from the crowds filling the streets only by

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strips of canvas on which are traced in huge red hieroglyphs the words: 'Raise higher the red banner of Chairman Mao's ideas.'

Mao Tse-tung's name is plastered over literally all the city walls. At every corner, in every street, on every square, in all the hotels, restaurants and offices there have been placed massive red boards on which his utterances are traced in gold paint. Tablets bearing quotations from his writings are affixed to the handlebars of bicycles and baby carriages. Over the doors of houses and shops are portraits of Mao against a background of golden rays or framed by varicoloured electric lamps.

The Hsinchiao Hotel, where I had stayed in the summer as well—it is specially reserved for foreigners—was now also plastered with portraits of Mao Tse-tung and quotations. The longest quotation covered up the bas-relief in the lobby depicting the Chinese people's march to socialism. Two quotations and a portrait hung on the walls of my room. Chairman Mao even followed me into the bathroom: stamped in red on the towels was the slogan: 'Let us turn Peking into a big school of Mao Tse-tung's ideas.'

It is not only Peking that has been turned into such a 'school'. Mao's utterances and portraits were to be seen at every step in all the other cities we visited—Nanking, Shanghai and Hangchow. Sometimes we came across the propagation of Mao's ideas in the most unlikely places. In the Nanking Zoo there were no signs on the cages or enclosure naming the animals within, but beside each was a big red board with some gold-lettered dictum of Mao Tse-tung's. The sign next to the cage occupied by brown bears read:

'Whatever the enemy may be like every and any enemy has to be fought. One must not take a light-minded attitude towards the enemy. One must recognise him in every guise and fight him' . . .

In Hangchow representatives of Luhsingshe, the Chinese tourist agency, prepared another surprise for our group. They took us by boat across Lake Hsihu to a little island where in a graceful light pavilion lives a parrot from Yunnan. It was a big parrot, black as a crow, with a red beak and small angry eyes. The attendant stuck a piece of meat through the bars of its cage.

'Do you want meat?' he asked the bird.

'Meat! Meat!' the parrot cried eagerly. The attendant pulled his hand back. 'Then say what you were taught . . . Come on, now, say it!'

The parrot said nothing, only clicked its beak and twisted its head about. The attendant teased it with the piece of meat and impatiently repeated: 'Wei, wei! Come on, say it . . .'

At last the parrot lifted its head and screamed three times: 'Mao Tse-tung wangsui! Mao Tse-tung wangsui!' (Long live Mao Tse-tung!)

The attendant was overjoyed. Apparently he regarded his parrot as one of the wonders of the 'cultural revolution'.

That we were in the country swept by this 'revolution' we were

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reminded on all hands. The opening words of a news item circulated by the Hsinhua Agency impressed themselves on my memory. In its customary bombastic style it reported: 'The whirlwind of the great proletarian cultural revolution is sweeping China!'

The whirlwind analogy was certainly appropriate. The 'cultural revolution' was indeed wreaking havoc in China's cities. But 'great, proletarian, cultural'? There has been no lack of justified critical comment on this score in the world press. However, as the Chinese themselves say, 'better to see once than to hear a hundred times'. One of the first things I did in Peking was to revisit one of its busiest streets—Wangfuching.

I found this street, in which are located the best shops of the capital, many restaurants, the central department store and the offices of the *People's Daily*, changed beyond recognition. In the first place, the signs with its old name have been pasted over with paper and its new name not yet put up. The neon signs of the shops have been taken down, the shopwindows have become as like as so many peas: all display the portrait and utterances of Mao Tse-tung.

The famous arcade, Tunan Shihchang (Oriental Calm), has been renamed Tungfeng Shihchang (Oriental Whirlwind). I tried to find the famous bookshop selling rare Chinese and European editions. It no longer exists. Later I learned that its stock of books had been burned as 'not reflecting Chairman Mao's ideas'. A similar fate befell other bookshops. To think that this is happening in the country which was the first in the world to invent paper and master the art of printing . . .

Not only the literary classics have become a rarity in present-day China. The wonderful Chinese works of art—chinaware, jade and wooden figurines, pottery, ivory objects, paintings on bamboo and silk—have also been withdrawn from sale. Antiquary and art shops have been closed. Antiquities are now sold only to foreigners for foreign exchange. In one of these closed shops in Shanghai I saw wooden bowls and the carvings of animals of the most exquisite workmanship. Above them was a little wooden marker with this sign in English: 'For thousands of years, wood-carving in China has been considered as a celebrated folk-craft. Types of wood carving are numerous, exquisite and attractive.'

If that is so, why have these and similar objects of 'celebrated folk-craft' been forbidden to the Chinese people and pronounced 'harmful' and 'worthless', why must they vanish at the demand of the 'Red Guards' as 'not reflecting Chairman Mao's ideas'?

In effect, sentence of death has been pronounced on China's centuries-old culture. And we saw it being carried out. The 'whirlwind of the cultural revolution' has swept away nearly all the art treasures preserved as museum pieces in the world famous Yihoyuan Palace in Peking. The delicately painted porcelain vases, the huge mirrors in frames of carved ebony, the colourful glass chandeliers, the ancient

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pieces of furniture have all vanished. Many frescoes have been smeared over with lime and cement, because someone disapproved of their 'feudal tinge'. The museum guides are all gone. The rooms and galleries are filled with idling 'Red Guards'. Day and night they are there, and there they perform their natural functions. Some of the rooms stink to high heaven . . .

While in Hangchow we visited Lingyin ('Abode of the Spirit'), one of the biggest Buddhist monasteries in China. Its pride are the dozens of small and big statues of Buddha and his disciples carved in a granite cliff. During their occupation the Japanese hacked some of them out of the cliff and shipped them to Japan. Now, we are told, the 'Red Guards' are arguing about what to do with the remaining figures: destroy them or spare them. Meanwhile the stone faces of the Buddhas have been covered with paper posters reading: 'Let us destroy all old junk,' 'Long live Mao Tse-tung!'

The 'cultural revolution' strikes both at cultural values and the men who produce them. We saw posters in Shanghai commenting on the rumoured suicides of some members of the creative intelligentsia. There have been reports in the foreign press that persecution by the 'Red Guards' had led Lao She, author of the novel *Ricksha*, opera singer Chou Hsing-fang, literary critic Fu Liu, translator of Balzac and Romain Rolland, and others to commit suicide. In Hanghow I saw posted in the streets the photograph of one of the suicides. The caption under it sneeringly stated that he had 'not been able to endure two months of criticism by the revolutionary students, who had urged him to re-educate himself in the spirit of Chairman Mao's ideas'. The body of the suicide was photographed with a rope around the neck. The man had apparently hanged himself . . .

The 'cultural revolution', it appears, spares neither the living nor the dead. 'Red Guards' from Peking University ran riot in the cemetery in the western part of Peking where rest the mortal remains of the famous Chinese painter Chi Pai-shih. They toppled many gravestones to the ground, including that of the great painter which they then plastered with insulting posters. Chi Pai-shih, who died in 1957, is now posthumously accused of painting 'black pictures'. In truth, he was the bard of the Chinese rural scene and painted flowers, birds, trees and animals. He lived very modestly, demonstratively refused to sell his paintings to the Japanese during their occupation, was close to the common people and was dearly loved by them . . .

Twice this year, in June and October, I witnessed the stormy events in front of the Peking Communist Party Committee offices on Taichichang Street. On June 2, the committee's first secretary, Peng Chen, was removed by the Party Central Committee on charges of 'secret actions against the ideas of Mao Tse-tung'. Next day a new first secretary was appointed, Li Hseuh-feng, head of the Central Committee's North-China bureau, and the membership of the committee was changed. On June 4, processions from all parts of the capital marched

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through Taichichang Street to pledge allegiance to the new committee. This was done to the beating of drums and the waving of flags. Every column carried portraits of Chairman Mao.

The members of the new committee were lined up in front of the building. Edging my way through the shouting and cheering crowd, I managed to watch for a few hours the arrival of more contingents from Peking factories and offices to greet the new leaders and promise 'boundless loyalty'. The marching and loyalty pledges went on for about two weeks. The *People's Daily* wrote that the reorganisation of the Peking Party Committee was 'a new victory for the ideas of Mao Tse-tung in the cultural revolution'.

But in mid-October all the loyalty pledges were forgotten. Taichichang Street—now renamed Prevention of Revisionism Street—was plastered with proclamations. They covered the whole front of the party committee building. Listed on them were charges against the committee and its first secretary, Li Hsueh-feng. The street was choked from curb to curb with shouting 'Red Guards'.

One of the proclamations, written in big characters on 30 metre-long sheets, enumerated 21 charges against Li Hsueh-feng. For the most part they were excerpts from statements he was supposed to have made five or six years ago to party and YCL functionaries. It seemed strange indeed that these teen-age 'Red Guards' should have such precise knowledge of what Li had said and when. Somewhat later, I came across another proclamation, setting out the charges against a member of the All-China Women's Federation Executive, Wang Kuang-mei (the wife of Liu Shao-chi, Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic). She was accused of 'white terror' and 'counter-revolution' and the charges were based on private telephone conversations. Having read a few more of these 'exposure proclamations', I had enough evidence that these 'young followers of Mao' had intimate knowledge of the goings and doings of the accused. It was obvious that the pen of these young 'exposers' was guided by an adult hand. But whose hand?

And another question suggested itself in reading these numerous proclamations: why was the fate of many Party and government leaders being decided by these youngsters and not by the Party, by the people of China, its workers, peasants and professionals? Indeed, why were mature adults practically removed from political life and immature 'Red Guards' allowed to decide matters of great public importance?

I tried to find the answer during my recent travels in China. Besides Peking, our tourist group visited Shanghai, Nanking and Hangchow. Everywhere we read these big-character proclamations and, when allowed by our Chinese guides, talked to the people. . . . Who is behind the 'Cultural Revolution'

Our very first encounters with the 'Red Guards' in Peking convinced us that they were being directed and instructed by men in military uniform. As soon as a trainload arrived at the Peking railway station, the 'Red Guard' leaders would march up to a man wearing

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the green public-security uniform to get their instructions. In fact, until quite recently, the Peking 'Red Guards' had their headquarters in the public-security building.

During their mass demonstrations, the 'Red Guards' travel in army trucks, and as a rule there are two or three soldiers on each truck. The marching columns are likewise led by soldiers. Many 'Red Guards' have been given army uniforms. On November 2, the Communist Party Central Committee and Council of State issued instructions for the 'Red Guards' to 'submit to the leadership of the army'. The Chinese army, it will be recalled, is now controlled by Defence Minister Lin Piao. Mao Tse-tung has been officially designated as commander-in-chief of the 'Red Guards' and Lin Piao as deputy commander-in-chief. Lin Piao is always referred to as 'Chairman Mao's closest comrade-in-arms and best disciple'.

The thousands of 'Red Guards' gathered in the capital report daily to the Party Central Committee offices for instructions from a member of the Central Committee 'cultural revolution staff'. At the head of the staff is Chen Po-ta, a Political Bureau member, and his first deputy is Kiang Ching, the wife of Mao Tse-tung.

The Chinese press no longer conceals the fact that many prominent Party officials now denounced as 'evil-doers' in recent years sharply criticised Mao's economic experiments, notably the 'big leap' and people's communes. No small number of officials of the Party central and provincial committees criticised not only Mao's practical activities, but were also highly doubtful of his political and philosophical conceptions. Peking's repeated failures in Asia and Africa, China's growing self-isolation on the world scene and in the international labour movement have evidently led more people to doubt the correctness of Mao Tse-tung's ideas.

Their application has cost the Chinese people a very high price. Industrial and agricultural output dropped drastically and is now barely back at the 1957–58 level. In the people's communes we were shown near Peking and Hangchow, we found the peasants living in extreme poverty and congestion. At the big Nanking fertilizer plant we visited, a skilled worker averages about 40 yuans a month, whereas a bicycle, China's most widely-used vehicle, costs at least 125, a man's suit 100, and a television set 440 yuans. Though the People's Republic is now in its eighteenth year, nearly all foodstuffs are rationed.

The Chinese are being urged to devote all their energies to production. Mao Tse-tung, they are told, teaches 'not to fear difficulties and face sacrifice with courage'. But at a Nanking factory we were told that a front-rank worker, that is, one who overfulfils his production quota, receives as a bonus only a pocket edition of quotations from Mao Tse-tung. There are no paid holidays, and when a worker takes sick he has to pay the doctor himself. As for the level of the medical services, this is what we were told by Liang Hsing-lang, director of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'The East is Red' sanatorium near Hangchow, which specialises in stomach ailments, hypertension, rheumatism and women's disorders:

'Some of our patients suffer from excessive sentimentalism. This must be combated with the aid of the works of Chairman Mao. Every day our patients read the works of Chairman Mao and as a result are imbued with optimism. Medicine is, of course, important, but politics must always come first'.

However, during our stay in Shanghai and Nanking we were able to see that events are not always following a course favourable to China's present rulers.

Outwardly, Shanghai and Nanking can hardly be distinguished from Peking. As in the capital, housewalls are plastered with 'Red Guard' leaflets and proclamations, and the streets are dotted with portraits of Mao and large red boards with excerpts from his writings. But in Nanking, alongside appeals to crush the local Party committee, we found inscriptions of a different kind: 'Let us defend the Nanking Party Committee; we will not allow it to be overthrown!' In Shanghai, the controversy over the fate of the Party committee has gone beyond the bandying of slogans and appeals.

Late in August, the Shanghai Communist Party Committee was accused of 'revisionism', and on September 4 a detachment of 'Red Guards' arrived from Peking and attacked the party offices, using sticks, army belts and stones against resisters. The workers of Shanghai Textile Mill No. 1 tried to stop the attack, but the Peking 'Red Guard' proved stronger. Since then, however, the situation has changed somewhat. True, more contingents have been arriving from Peking in order to 'completely reorganise' the Shanghai committee. But now they are meeting with more determined resistance from some local 'Red Guard' organisations, controlled by the Shanghai Party leadership. Leaflets issued by the Peking 'revolutionary students' threaten to 'tear off the dogs' heads' of the Shanghai 'traitors'. The Shanghai 'Red Guards' pay back in kind, calling the newcomers 'tramps', 'hoodlum gangs', 'imposters', and demanding that an end be put to their villainy and the Party committee defended. There has even been hand-to-hand fighting. . . . Nevertheless, the Peking intruders are still at it. In recent days they were able to win over part of the Shanghai 'Red Guards' and continue their frenzied campaign against the Party committee . . .

The Peking leaders, however, believe that, despite discomfitures here and there, the 'Red Guards' are doing their work well and are removing from the Party and government service all overt and covert opponents of Mao Tse-tung.

The training of Chinese schoolchildren in recent years has been in a spirit of blind loyalty to Mao Tse-tung, of unquestioned submission to all his instructions. And the training begins at the age of three.

In Peking we visited the kindergarten run by Textile Factory No. 2. Tiny tots sitting on low benches were reciting, after their teacher:

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'We must learn from Chairman Mao. We must be worthy pupils of Mao. We must wipe out all the scum.'

At a sign from their teacher they clapped their hands and recited:

'Chairman Mao is the red sun in our hearts!

'Mummy and daddy are dear to us, but there is no one dearer than Chairman Mao!'

Did the children know any other songs or fairy tales? No, the teacher said, they sing only of Chairman Mao and they 'don't need' fairy tales. To our remark that many fairy tales were based on folklore and taught the children to be good, honest, fair and industrious, and that fairy tales contained much of the wisdom of the people, the teacher replied with irritation:

'And who needs this wisdom of the people! There is only one wisdom in the world, the wisdom of our great leader, Chairman Mao! That's the only wisdom we should teach . . .'

The picture was the same in the three other kindergartens we were shown . . .

All schoolchildren (from Grade 1 to Grade 6) are expected to memorise selected quotations from the works of Mao. Beginning with the seventh grade, studies have been suspended, as also in all colleges and universities, to allow the students to share in the 'cultural revolution'. Among other things, they are required to memorise more of Mao Tse-tung's ideas from the *Collection of Excerpts from the Works of Chairman Mao Tse-tung* supplied to every boy and girl. Every morning they recite from this book, and also on various occasions during the day. They have been issued printed instructions as to which quotation should be recited on one or another occasion. You will find these 'revolutionary students' reciting in trains and buses, at the theatre, cinema, circus, before the performance, between the acts. Before going to bed they open the book again and sing a quotation from Mao put to music. Their main concern, they are repeatedly told, should be to live by the four 'always' rules: 'Always keep the book of Chairman Mao's sayings in your hands; always keep Chairman Mao's sayings on your lips; always keep Chairman Mao's ideas in your heart; always behave in accordance with Chairman Mao's instructions.'

This blind adulation of Mao Tse-tung is the chief condition for admission to the 'Red Guards'. From several talks with 'Red Guards', and from their publications, I gather that the chief membership requirement is 'ideological behaviour', that is, complete acceptance of the ideas of Chairman Mao.

The indoctrination continues in the 'Red Guard' organisations, which have been set up in every school and in many factories and offices. Each organisation has its committee, but, we were told at Textile Factory No. 2 in Peking, Communist Party bodies have no say in forming, directing or dissolving these committees.

The 'Red Guard' committees work under district headquarters, which, in turn, are controlled by a city committee. In Shanghai, I saw

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a list of instructions for 'Red Guards' prominently displayed on Nanking Road, the main street. The 'Red Guards', it said, were authorised to publish and circulate their own newspapers, hold mass meetings, rallies and processions, undergo military training (rifle, bayonet, hand grenade practice). In fact, some elite 'Red Guard' units are now designated as 'detachments' or 'regiments' and have become paramilitary organizations. The 'Red Guards' threaten to 'to tear off the heads' of their opponents, 'wring their necks', 'throw them to the ground and trample them to death'. They call for 'terror', 'big murders and big massacres'.

Anyone who has been to China recently could see that hatred is being whipped up not only against sincere Communists and patriots, but also against the Soviet Union, the friend of the Chinese people.

The Persecution of National Minorities in China

Literaturnaya Gazeta, 24 January 1967

In the course of the 'cultural revolution' in China, people were subjected to cruel persecution for admiring the Soviet Union . . .

Abdykadyr Abdrakhmanov, a former citizen of the Chinese People's Republic says: 'Almost on the first day of the "cultural revolution" in Sinkiang I was accused of "revisionism", beaten and dismissed from work because my relatives live in Soviet Kazakhstan. There was every indication that I would be sent to a camp where all people suspected of admiring the Soviet Union are herded. Millions of Chinese have already resettled in Sinkiang. The local population is driven away from its ancient lands, into the hinterlands, into lifeless deserts. Enforced assimilation is taking place. Young Kazakh, Uighur and Kirghiz girls are taken away from their parents and forced under the penalty of death to marry Chinese.'

The former leader of the writers' organisation of the Sinkiang-Uighur Autonomous Region of China, Ziva Samedi, who is now in Kazakhstan, was deported in 1957 to a 'labour education' camp together with other young Uighur and Kazakh intellectuals who admired Soviet Kazakhs and spoke with gratitude about the Soviet Union's disinterested aid to China. Samedi writes about the fate of the talented Kazakh writer Kazhikumar Shabdanov. His first book was assessed positively by the Chinese literary critics, but in 1957 he was deported to a 'labour education' camp where he committed suicide, being unable to stand any longer the methods of 're-education'. Ziya Samedi managed to escape from the camp and reach Kazakhstan.

A former lieutenant-colonel of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, the holder of three orders and five medals, Balkhash Bafin, a Kazakh by nationality, also crossed the border. 'Representatives of the Kazakh national intelligentsia were confronted with the ridiculous charge of having allegedly attempted to establish a Kazakh khanate and to

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unite in it under their leadership all the Kazakhs of China, Mongolia and the Soviet Union,' Bafin says. 'The "khanate" hoax was invented after the failure of a plan to create a "new history" of the Kazakhs, Uighurs and Kirghiz of Sinkiang. According to this plan of the leaders of the CPR and the Chinese Communist Party, the "new history" was to "prove" that the Uighurs, Kazakhs and Kirghiz were actually Chinese and therefore had a "single motherland from the southern tip of China to the Aral Sea". In other words, the "new history" was needed to support the great-Power chauvinism of the CPR leaders.'

Ching Yang, a New China News Agency correspondent who criticised the 'people's communes' in the press and wrote about the poverty and deprivation of rights of the Kazakhs and Uighurs, hanged himself to avoid arrest. Bafin's relatives who remained in Sinkiang were arrested when they received from him in Kazakhstan a parcel of food wrapped in a Soviet newspaper. Other witnesses describe how the Red Guards pulled down ancient mosques. They splashed the Muslim clergy with paint and paraded them through the streets.

Commenting on the testimony of the refugees, the Kazakh writer Anuar Alimzhanov says: 'I saw how hungry, emaciated people dressed in rags fell to their knees, embracing stones and shrubs and kissing the ground, after passing the border posts.'

The Far Eastern Frontier

Mikhail Maguta

Novosti News Agency, 13 March 1967

The situation is tense at this frontier post where Russian trains pass into China. I have seen many outrageous scenes of interference by Chinese Red Guards on the Soviet side of the border. This interference is aimed at causing minor disturbances right up to halting Russian trains bound for Vietnam with war aid.

A typical situation developed recently when a number of Chinese transport workers appeared on the Russian side of the border to handle a freight train crossing into China. Their visas were out of date and the Russian immigration authorities asked them to go back and put them in order. The result was a most violent and hysterical outburst. The Soviet station master told them: 'Stop shouting and if you've got a complaint let's hear it from your leader.'

There was silence. One of the Chinese telephoned to the station on the other side. Then he came back and gave orders to the rest of the party. Shouting and screaming and chanting from the *Thoughts of Mao Tse-tung* began—and worse. The Chinese lay down on the line. They stopped all trains and completely disrupted the work of the station. Soviet officials ordered them away and it was only after some time that they left with shouts and curses.

A couple of days later a larger group of Chinese crossed the border

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to cause an even bigger scene. They waved anti-Soviet leaflets in Russian and shouted anti-Soviet slogans. The frontier police rounded them up and took their literature. Then violence began. The Chinese, hysterical with rage, broke into the offices of the control inspection post and demanded that their literature be returned. The officer in charge ordered them out. At this the Chinese went berserk. They smashed down the doors of the office, ripping them from their hinges. They shouted: 'You fascists . . . you are fighting against the Chinese people with your allies the Americans.'

By this time Soviet police and officials had been reinforced by a posse of citizens from the town. A Russian station worker, Dmitry Kolenko, shouted at the Chinese: 'Why do you want this rotten literature?'

'We are students learning the Russian language,' came the reply.

'These are not study aids,' answered Kolenko. 'These are calculated lies about the Soviet people. And we shall not allow you to insult us. We'll give you decent text-books.'

'No, no, no!' screamed the Chinese. 'We only read Mao Tse-tung.'

The shouting and the confrontation went on for several hours. Finally Russian police, railway workers, and ordinary people formed a solid barrier and slowly pushed the Chinese back across the border, where they were received like heroes.

The Chinese side of the junction is completely under the control of the Red Guards, and the Soviet citizens working there have not seen its station master for a long time.

When the rowdies left Gorodekovo, the station master on duty asked the few Chinese workers remaining there:

'Could you tell us, please, what is it you want? What are you counting on? Do you want a conflict?'

After a long silence the Chinese admitted: 'We can do nothing about this. We are made to behave this way.'

The authorities at Suifenho are creating unbearable conditions for the Soviet transport workers engaged there. The Red Guards keep organising various incidents and block Soviet trains. Railwaymen from Gorodekovo were forced at Suifenho to go through an infuriated crowd shouting abuse and shaking their fists.

When Grigory Kazak, assistant station-master of Gorodekovo, went with a group of his employees to Suifenho to discover the results of the station's work—this, incidentally, is stipulated by the Soviet-Chinese agreement—the delegation was met with shouts of abuse. As a result Kazak did not settle a single business issue with Sui, assistant station-master of Suifenho.

This is the fantastic situation.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RED GUARDS AND POSTERS

Red Guards and Party Committees (extracts)

Pravda, 18 September 1966

In the last few days the Chinese press, and also many leaflets and big character posters displayed in Peking, have shown that the Red Guards had tried by force to smash up party committees in a number of Chinese towns and provinces; and an increasing number of names of party workers are appearing who are charged with various anti-party activities, and lists are being distributed of people who are accused of 'crimes' allegedly committed by those communists.

Fierce criticism is now being levelled at Li Ta, one of the oldest communists who, during the cultural revolution, was removed from the post of rector of Wuhan University. Like others, he is accused of having opposed the 'great' ideas of Mao Tse-tung and of not recognising Chairman Mao's great development of Marxism-Leninism. Until recently Li Ta was a member of the Learned Council of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and head of the Chinese Philosophical Society; he is one of the few living delegates to the first congress of the Communist Party of China which took place in 1921. The press reports that he 'attacked' the general line, the Great Leap Forward, and the people's communes, and that he had stated that the Great Leap Forward had become a great retreat.

One result of the implementation of the decisions of the eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on the cultural revolution was, according to reports in the paper *Liaoning Jih Pao*, the so-called 'exposure' of Cheng Fang, head of the Propaganda Department of the Chinese Communist Party committee in the town of Shenyang. The paper says that he attacked 'the greatest leader, Chairman Mao, and the all-victorious ideas of Mao Tse-tung'; the paper also said that he had called the Great Leap Forward 'idle talk', and had said that in the international field China had become seriously isolated. Sharp attacks are also being made against Sung Chen-ting, head of the Propaganda Department of the Party Committee of Chinglin Province, who is accused of supporting the CPSU 20th and 21st congresses. The Red Guards are demanding the removal from office of leaders of the Tientsin urban committee of the Chinese Communist Party who, in their view, do not support the ideas of Mao Tse-tung; they also criticise the Party committee of the Hunan Province for sabotaging the cultural revolution.

The Red Guards have also charged the editorial board of the provincial newspaper *Kujen Jih Pao* with undermining the cultural revolution because it printed the writings of Mao Tse-tung, the name of Peking University, and the name of a women's magazine in black type while in other parts of the country these were written in red and pink. . . .

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Red Guards are organising direct attacks on party committees, which lead to serious clashes between workers who organise and render support to the communists in defence of the Party committees, and detachments of the Red Guards. One such clash took place a few days ago in Kiangsi Province, where the workers declared: We shall resolutely defend the Provincial Committee and we shall not allow it to come under attack. Red Guards in Anhwei Province provoked clashes in front of the Party committee in the town of Tapu; and it recently became known that a detachment of Red Guards in Kwangchow attempted to drag the monument to Sun Yat-sen off its pedestal. Red Guards, who had come from Peking for an exchange of experience and leadership in the cultural revolution, stated that Sun Yat-sen was an embodiment of revolutionary capitalism, and they therefore wanted to pull down the monument to him and replace it with a statue of Mao Tse-tung. A scuffle started in which the police were forced to intervene. That monument remained in place, but the monument to Pushkin in Shanghai was pulled down by Red Guards and its pedestal was pasted with leaflets eulogising Mao Tse-tung.

While subjecting people whom they describe as 'harmful elements' and 'revisionists' to public beatings, the Red Guards are also organising anti-Soviet demonstrations. Under the banner of combating revisionism, they have torn down the crests of the Union Republics of the USSR from the building of the industrial exhibition. . . . They have also torn down the emblems of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society, and in Shanghai have torn off the nameplate from the building of the Palace of Chinese-Soviet Friendship and put up their own notice which reads: 'Palace of the Struggle against Revisionism'.

The Red Guards Obey Orders (excerpts)

Komsomolskaya Pravda, 21 September 1966

The actions of the Red Guards are of a clearly-expressed 'pogrom' character. They break into houses, commit outrages, and subject their victims to insults and beatings. And the Komsomol badges do indeed disappear. The newspaper *Chungkuo Chingnien Pao*, organ of the Central Committee of the Chinese Komsomol, has also disappeared. Its 19 August edition was its last: *Chungkuo Chingnien*, the magazine of the Central Committee of the Chinese Komsomol, has also stopped publication without warning. Instead, in the courtyard of the building housing the Central Committee of the Komsomol, an 'exhibition of the crimes of the Central Committee of the Chinese Komsomol' has been staged, and in the streets around the building there were crowds with posters expressing approval of the reorganisation of the Chinese Communist Party, although this reorganisation has not been reported officially in the press.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The reorganisation of the Peking City Committee of the Komsomol, carried out in June this year, was typical. As the now defunct *Chungkuo Chingnien Pao* said at the time, the displaced leaders of the city committee of the Komsomol were 'accomplices of the counter-revolutionary clique, felt fierce hatred for socialism, and had tried to turn the Komsomol into a weapon for the restoration of capitalism'. The newspaper's argument showed that the criterion for all the charges was the city committee's attitude to Mao Tse-tung's works. 'Whoever opposes Mao Tse-tung's ideas is a counter-revolutionary', was the heading of an article directed against the Peking city committee of the Komsomol. The paper described as a counter-revolutionary act a statement by one of the committee's leaders that working time at enterprises should not be taken up with learning Mao Tse-tung's articles, and the paper described as 'defamation of Mao Tse-tung's ideas' the words of one of the leaders of the Peking city committee that for a surgeon the most important thing was the ability to heal the sick. This was an unforgivable liberty, for the whole Chinese press is now saying that it is thanks only to Mao Tse-tung's article that sportsmen set up records, workers master machines, and tradesmen successfully sell their wares.

Black Lists of the Cultural Revolution

From an article datelined 'Peking, 26 September, from our own correspondent'.

Komsomolskaya Pravda, 27 September 1966

Peking residents, children and adults, are at present engaged in writing slogans, which have in recent days been specially developed in abundant quantity, in yard-high characters on buildings, gates, and stone walls: 'Having Taken Hold of Military Activity by the Whole Party, Carry Out the Policy: The Whole People are Soldiers!' 'Imperialists are Paper Tigers!' 'Ten Thousand Years to Chairman Mao!' The number of variants in which these slogans are being used is not very great. But the quantity of paint used for drawing yard-high characters is probably measured in dozens of tons.

Old, weathered posters are being cleaned off. But new ones appear—announcements about a 'special', 'urgent', and 'extra urgent' search for 'disappeared criminals'. I examine the photograph of a pleasant looking woman and read the description: 'Medium height, shortsighted, stutters slightly, a filled tooth'. It says that anyone finding her should immediately arrest her and report to the headquarters of one of the Red Guard troops, telephone 44-51-09. Of what crime is she accused?

The photograph of a young man is posted five steps away. 'At 9.10 a.m. on 10 September, he said that he had been hit in the eye by a rock, bandaged the eye with a piece of cloth, and did not report to work', reads the 'Nature of Crime' section of the leaflet. 'At 13.00

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hours he was in the dormitory. At 14.00 he was already gone.' And again: 'Find, arrest, and deliver . . .'

Throughout this large city, these and other announcements, signed by Red Guards, have been put up. Some are printed, others duplicated, and others are hand-written; the photographs on them resemble some sort of identity card. The accusations are laconic—'counter-revolutionary, rightist element' . . .

Amazing, it would seem. But today, in the seventeenth year of the CPR's existence, accusations of this nature are being heard everywhere. What is meant by them? I open an issue of the army newspaper. 'The anti-party and anti-socialist element He Lu-ting, who for a long time held a leading post in the field of musical creativity, mouthed many anti-party and anti-socialist words, thought up many anti-party and anti-socialist black songs. Today we must once and for all tear off his mask, once and for all expose all his plots.' Thus begins an article devoted to one of the greatest Chinese composers, an old communist, who only recently held the post of director at the Shanghai Conservatory. Someone's intrepid hand 'analyses' one of his latest choral songs, 'Night Over the River Hsinanchiang': 'Behind the facade of glorifying socialist construction, He Lu-ting viciously disseminated poison. First of all, he composed the tune of this song in a powerless and weak fashion, he even utilised six-eight time, which was frequently used in lullabies and dance music of the European bourgeoisie during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Secondly, he made the notation "With delicate feeling". What was his intention? Is it not clear that he had thereby tried to represent the militant enthusiasm of our working class as a striving for rest and idleness? Did he by this song wish to glorify the heroes of our working class, busy in the construction of hydroelectric power stations, or their revolutionary enthusiasm which manifests itself in the spirit of self-reliance? No, certainly not. He distorted the heroic image of our working class, came forward against our Great Leap Forward! But what is most criminal is that throughout the song, from beginning to end, He Lu-ting utilised harmony as used in the West for church music! What did he want but to defile the revolutionary spirit of our Great Leap Forward? Is this not clear proof that He Lu-ting fiercely hated the general line and the Great Leap Forward?'

Another example from the black lists of the 'Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution': the former rector and party committee secretary of Peking University, Lu Ping, is today being called in China nothing other than 'black bandit', 'counter-revolutionary', or 'agent of Soviet revisionists'. What, then, are his crimes? It seems that he followed educational principles accepted in the USSR and other socialist countries. Students of the philosophy department studied philosophy, those in the history department—history, and those in the physics department—physics, instead of ecstatically memorising quotations from Mao

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tse-tung, as prescribed. In addition to the rector, the black list contains several dozen professors and instructors of Peking University.

It is impossible to calculate how many writers, actors, film directors, and members of the technical intelligentsia have today in China been given the murderous label 'black bandit'. Leaders of departments of propaganda, culture, and education in the majority of party provincial committees have been so tagged. But Red Guards and those who inspire them are not satisfied with just their cultural and educational workers. Here is what those under whose unlimited control are not only the Red Guard mobs but also the presses of the *People's Daily*, write:

'He sells black goods—bourgeois pacifism, and preaches that capitulation is better than struggle, that peace is above all, that life is above all'—this is written about the Soviet writer Mikhail Sholokhov. The newspaper *People's Daily* evaluates his story *The Fate of a Man* as a premeditated attack on the ideas of the 'great leader, great teacher, and great helmsman—Chairman Mao'. I read the newspaper's 'analysis' of the story and see that the hand of the man who wrote all this was guided by the same unremitting hatred of the Middle Ages towards humanism which raised the axe over He Lu-ting's song.

. . . Red Guards walk along the streets. Suspiciously they examine the faces of passers-by. Leaflets about a search, innumerable posters with denunciations of 'counter-revolutionaries', speeches by the highest government and party leaders with appeals to 'hit the headquarters of those who are invested with power, who have penetrated into the party and are following the capitalist road'—all this creates a feverish atmosphere of general suspicion, deliberately spreads among the people a feeling that the enemy lurks everywhere. In today's China there exists, if one can say so, an 'absolute freedom' of speech for exposing statements against 'the ideas of Chairman Mao'. This is a freedom for denunciations, for attacks on those who in their statements had in the least bit deviated from the norms rigidly prescribed by the anthology of Mao Tse-tung's quotations.

Red Guards against Culture

Excerpts from an unsigned article datelined Peking, 27 September

Izvestiya, 28 September 1966

The chairman of the Chinese Mathematical Society, Hua Lo-keng, has become the object of Red Guard attacks. An outstanding scientist whose works are known to all mathematicians throughout the world, is being called a 'reactionary bourgeois authority' by Red Guards of a number of Peking secondary schools. The Chinese mathematician is being accused of having 'made rabid statements against Chairman

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mao', and of having at one time called the 'Great Leap Forward hasty and remote from real life'. Red Guards of the Mathematics Institute of the Chinese Academy of Sciences made a different accusation against Hua Lo-keng. They accuse him of praising achievements of the Soviet Union in the field of outer space exploration.

It is characteristic that to this day, no outstanding Chinese scientist or representative of the arts has supported the 'cultural revolution', with the exception of the self-flagellation of Kuo Mo-jo, who had announced that all his writings should be burned. All this, however, did not save the president of the Academy of Sciences from Red Guard criticism. Kuo Mo-jo is today being called a 'reactionary writer' and is being accused of 'political capitulationism'.

Recently your correspondent witnessed another barbarous act by the Red Guards. In the northwestern section of Peking there is a cemetery . . . Peking residents called it the family cemetery of Chi Pai-shih. Here rest the remains of an outstanding Chinese artist, People's Artist of the Chinese People's Republic and laureate of the International Peace Prize Chi Pai-shih and his wife. Red Guards from the Peking Foreign Languages Institute appeared there. Within a few minutes they had destroyed all monuments, dug up gravestones, and left many insulting inscriptions.

Red Guards Receive Official Approval (extracts)

Sovetskaya Rossiya, 5 October 1966

The 'shock troops', the 'fearless vanguard', the 'pioneers of the Great Proletarian Revolution'—this is what Chinese newspapers call the Red Guards—the adolescents and children with red armbands on their sleeves. For two months now the political life of the country has been overshadowed by the Red Guard movement which, according to the Chinese press, expresses the character and direction of the 'cultural revolution'.

Soon after the eleventh Plenum of the CC of the Chinese Communist Party in August of this year, held under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung, crowds of youths filled the streets of Peking. They began to drag people who seemed 'suspicious' to them out of their homes and to torture them, chanted anti-Soviet slogans by the embassy building of the USSR, insulted and beat up diplomatic representatives from socialist countries, destroyed historical monuments, burned books by Pushkin and Rolland, broke records of melodies by Chaikovsky and Beethoven, and destroyed ancient sculptures and paintings in museums.

The actions of the Red Guards, as the Chinese press has emphasised, signified the fact that the 'young patriots' had taken upon their shoulders the 'historical mission' of 'carrying the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution through to the end', and of 'defending to the end the great ideas of Chairman Mao Tse-tung'. The Chinese press often

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recalls that at a meeting in Peking on 18 August Mao Tse-tung accepted a red armband from the Red Guards and put it on his sleeve. This was interpreted as complete approval of the movement.

If one reads the Chinese press attentively, it is impossible not to come to the conclusion that a quite definite political task has been placed before the Red Guards: to strike a blow against experienced cadres of revolutionaries, against party workers and the progressive intelligentsia—in a word against all those who remain true to the ideas of proletarian internationalism and fraternal solidarity with the workers of the socialist countries. Official propaganda in China has declared these people to be 'black bandits', 'revisionists', and 'servants of capitalism'. It is against them that the Red Guard detachments have been moved into action.

At a meeting in Peking on 31 August it was explained to these 'pioneers of the cultural revolution' that the 'main target of the blow are those who, having pushed their way into the Party and being in authority, are taking a capitalist road'. The formulation was military: 'Open artillery fire on the headquarters staffs'; that is, on party committees, local authorities, the management of enterprises, educational institutions, etc. And this order was immediately executed. In a leaflet issued by the students of the People's University it was said quite directly that 'apart from Chairman Mao, no one can be trusted', that 'it is necessary to defend only the Central Committee and Chairman Mao, and not to defend anyone else', and that it is permissible 'even not to defend the Central Committee'.

It would be hard now to find a party committee in the country that has not been subjected to attacks. For example, the Red Guards have opened 'concentrated fire' against the party bureau of North East China which, according to them, is 'pursuing an ominous course'. In a declaration which has been distributed in Peking they accuse the party bureau of North East China and also the party committees of the province and city of Uzilin of having 'agents of the bourgeoisie' in these organs who 'are impeding the activities of the most revolutionary comrades and are, in essence, opposing the cultural revolution' . . .

As has already been reported, havoc has been wrought with many organs of the press. Some newspapers and periodicals have been closed, others have changed their names, and the editorial boards of a number of publications have been reorganised. The chief editors of many of them have been removed from their posts. This fate, in particular, has struck Chun Ling, the chief editor of the newspaper, *Kwansi Daily*. He, like hundreds of others, is accused of 'opposition to propagating the ideas of Mao Tse-tung'. He said that Mao Tse-tung's books are not 'divine'. He strove for a 'well-rounded education for the masses in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism', without mentioning the ideas of Mao Tse-tung. 'This so-called Marxist-Leninist education is only a mask to deceive people.'

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The 'cultural revolution' has not overlooked many workers in literature, art, and science. For several weeks the Red Guards have been exercising complete dominion in the building of the All-Chinese Association of Literary and Art Workers. They have pasted leaflets on the walls criticising prominent cultural figures of the country. Among those whom they place with the 'bourgeois right elements' are the chairman of the Union of Dramatists of China, the secretaries of this Union, the deputy chairman of the All-Chinese Association of Literary and Art Workers, and many others . . . Hua Lo-keng, the well-known mathematician, the chairman of the Chinese Mathematics Society and a member of the scientific-technical association of the Chinese People's Republic, also came under the fire of the Red Guards . . .

It is characteristic that the Red Guards do not bear responsibility for their actions. While making a raid on the dormitory and building of the Ministry of Geology of the Chinese People's Republic, they carried out pogromist actions and beat up people. Their actions were resisted by the workers of the Ministry. However, the responsibility for what had happened was put upon the Ministry's party committee and upon the deputy minister . . .

The Red Guards are aiming at replacing 'old cadres'. The call to overthrow people who have been given power, who are in the ranks of the party, and who are 'taking a capitalist road' sounded again on 1 October during the celebrations of the 17th anniversary of the Chinese People's Republic. How can this be explained? Is it not that the 'old cadres' have learned from the example of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and that they do not accept the anti-Soviet slander with which the Red Guards are crammed full? Is it not because these people have got their ideas of Marxism-Leninism from original sources, and not only from the quotations of Mao Tse-tung?

Having abandoned their studies, detachments of adolescents are standing around for hours at meetings and proclaiming in chorus the same quotations and the same anti-Soviet slogans. They are being taught to 'train their fire on headquarters staffs', and it is impressed upon them that they must 'carry the Great Proletarian Revolution through to the end'.

March of the Red Guards

Yevgeny Yevtushenko

Literaturnaya Gazeta, 15 February 1967

Sun, do not argue—it's time you went to a
correction centre. You shine for the
Americans, and that's a double game.
There's no question, the snow is like a White
Guard. Homer was not just blind—he
was politically blind.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shakespeare was a criminal ninny—a pity
it's too late to beat him (pondering—
to be with Mao, Hamlet decided—not to
be) . . .
What, you musical rat, your bald patch
perspires with fear? For supper instead
of rice you'll eat Beethoven's records.
Art won't go down your throat? Hard to
swallow a chorale? Ah, my dear—tastes
bad, why did you play it then?
Eat Shostakovich, chew Mozart—your end
is at hand, bourgeois.

Heffers

Attractive free catalogues from a famous bookshop include

SOVIET UNION □ LATIN AMERICA

MODERN EUROPE □ AFRICA & ASIA

LINGUISTICS

SECONDHAND BOOKS

Write to

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD., Cambridge, England

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE, THE ARTS, AND EDUCATION

The Chinese Press on the Cultural Heritage of Nations

Literaturnaya Gazeta, 9 August 1966

Classical Literature and Art

It is to the category of 'poisonous weeds' that certain organs of the Chinese press relegate Dante's *Divine Comedy*, Rabelais' *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, Goethe's *Sorrows of the Young Werther*, Rolland's *Jean Christophe*; and also the works of Anatole France, Maupassant, etc. Giving a general estimate of western European literature and art, the newspaper *Kuangming Jih pao* says: 'The democratic value of the western literary heritage has gradually lost its former active significance, and with its help bourgeois ideology is steadily demoralising and poisoning our people, particularly the youth.'

The Peking *People's Daily*, 6 August 1966, in criticising the former first deputy head of the department of propaganda of the CC CPC, one Chou Yang, blames him for propagandising foreign culture. 'Chou Yang . . . has lavished praise on feudal and capitalist culture, and upon its representatives. Among these foreigners he extols Shakespeare, Tolstoi, Gogol, Belinsky and others; and of the ancient Chinese cultural figures he names Confucius, Lao Tse, Tung Chung-shu, Chih Kana, Su She, Tsao Hsueh, etc. . . . Of foreign works he cites *Othello, The Tempest, Romeo and Juliet, King Lear*, etc.'

Shakespeare: 'The central idea of the creativity of Shakespeare is bourgeois humanism . . . His ideas belong to the ideology of the exploiting classes; they are antagonistic to the ideology of the proletariat and therefore, if we are going to permit them to be spread without hindrance, and fail to subject them to severe criticism, they will exert an extremely harmful influence on the modern reader. If one regards Shakespeare's plays from today's point of view, it is obvious that they are radically opposed to socialist collectivism. . . . Shakespeare, taking the point of view of humanism, supports the power of the monarchy.' (*Kuangming Jih pao*)

Stendhal: 'In building a good life, we need not be inspired by the works of Stendhal. Taking this point of view is not an approach to his creativity, but only an analysis of his work frrom the standpoint of historical materialism. Stendhal has been dead a long while and today we bear no grudge against him. But, essentially, he was on a different road from ours. We cannot avoid divorcing ourselves from him ideologically.'

Balzac: 'Balzac extolled a reactionary theory of humanity. . . . The remedy which he proposed for the transformation of society was ridiculous and false'. (*Kuangming Jih pao*)

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Victor Hugo: 'Hugo in every way possible propagandises the bourgeois theory of humanity, striving to conceal the reality of the class struggle and of class oppression within bourgeois society. Hugo and the ideal heroes emanating from his pen, although they are dissatisfied with the reality of the bourgeois society of his time, are dissatisfied just because of their frustrated bourgeois interests. Their social ideal and its artistic embodiment, just as before, have the end purpose of reinforcing bourgeois society. . . . Victor Hugo's novel *L'homme qui rit* subjected certain irrational phenomena of capitalist society to a certain degree of criticism and analysis. However, the writer directed his efforts under the flag of bourgeois humanism and of the idea of improving society, of class reconciliation on the basis of a theory of 'human essence'. Such dreams of a humane society, and cries for the improvement of society, were directly contradicted by the fact that Hugo, a bourgeois writer in the days when the proletarian revolution was constantly growing, took up the bourgeois position and strove to preserve the capitalist order.' (*Kuangming Jih pao*)

Beethoven: Ma Ting-sheng, of the Scientific-Research Institute of Microbiology, Academy of Sciences, Chinese People's Republic, writes in the newspaper *Kuangming Jih pao*: 'As a result of hearing a good deal of western classical music, I gradually began to become confused in my class view of things. After that I often took great delight in the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven, and the notion of bourgeois-humanist 'love', which is extolled in a good part of this symphony created in me certain illusions: if the world truly could be filled by love between nations, then why could we not eliminate war entirely and secure a reign of eternal peace? . . . Thanks to the movement for socialist education and political instruction . . . I understood . . . that constant enthusiasm for western bourgeois classical music can only paralyse the revolutionary will.'

Classical ballet: This type of ballet 'preaches the reconciliation of the classes, the bourgeois theory of humanity; it corrrupts youth . . . Only consider: the languors of love at the courts of feudal magnates, assignations of dressed-up bourgeois maidens and cavaliers, beautiful seductresses, the gambolling and enthusiasm of the young—what does it all mean?' (*Kuangming Jih pao*)

Giselle: 'The absurdity of the subject, the contradiction of characters, logical inconsistencies and ideological reaction—these are readily perceived. The composer is 100 per cent behind the ruling class, portraying the peasant girl as the slave of the nobility, devoted to the nobility to death. . . . Can one really suppose that such so called 'classical productions' have occupied our socialist ballet art? No, that is impossible. . . . The Chinese Peking musical drama and the European ballet—all this old classical art is filled with feudal and bourgeois ideas.' (*Chefangchiun pao*)

Russian classical literature: Recently in Chinese newspapers there have

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeared criticisms of many of the classic Russian writers, beginning with Pushkin and Gogol, and ending with Chekhov and Tolstoi. These criticisms have been directed . . . against the 'extolling of love', the 'savouring of the corrupt life of landlords and aristocrats'. Certain Chinese writers perceive a 'revisionist world view' in the novels of Tolstoi and in Turgenev's *Notes of a Hunter*. Here are some typical remarks in the Chinese press:

On Pushkin: 'Pushkin produced no concrete analysis of national character and humanism; he regards them as an abstract, invariable criterion for writers.' (*Kuangming Jih pao*)

On Belinsky, Dobrolyubov, and Chernyshevsky: 'One has to accept with blind faith the so called literature and art of China in the thirties . . . when views on literature and art were guided by the ideas of the Russian bourgeois literary critics Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. But the ideology of these bourgeois democrats of the Tsarist epoch was not Marxist—it was bourgeois.' (*Chefangchiun pao*)

The newspaper *Peiching jipao* criticises the Chinese revolutionary cinema art of the thirties on the ground that it 'maintained the views on literature and art which were held by the Russian bourgeois literary critics Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov; while in the area of the theatre it followed Stanislavsky's system.' In the opinion of this newspaper, all this 'radically contradicts the ideas of Mao Tse-tung.'

The true renegade features of Sholokhov

Extracts from an article by Tsai Hui

People's Daily, 13 May 1966

In October 1965, the 'communist' and 'proletarian writer' Mikhail Sholokhov, in a state of awed excitement, accepted the Nobel Prize for Literature which even the French bourgeois writer Jean-Paul Sartre would not accept. In Sartre's words, to accept the Prize would be to receive 'a distinction reserved for the writers of the West or for the traitors of the East'.

Ever since the victory of the great October Socialist Revolution, the organisation in charge of awarding the Nobel Prize for Literature has sought for 'traitors of the East' among Russian authors in a hundred and one ways. And it is only those 'talents' among Russian writers who resolutely oppose communism and the October Socialist Revolution, whom they approve, take pains to seek out, and unstintingly reward.

In 1933, that is, in the sixteenth year after the victory of the October Revolution, the Nobel Prize Committee for the first time gave the Prize to a Russian writer. The writer was not Gorky or any other author who supported the socialist revolution. It was the 'White Russian' author, Ivan Bunin, who bitterly hated the October Revolution and fled to live in Paris.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With the same kind of political motivation, in 1958 the Committee gave the Prize to another notorious traitor, Boris Pasternak, author of the anti-communist novel *Doctor Zhivago*. And through this, reactionaries all over the world stirred up an anti-Soviet, anti-communist wave. At that time, the Soviet people angrily denounced the Nobel Prize for Literature as a 'tool of the West', and unanimously condemned the traitorous behaviour of Pasternak. The Soviet paper *Pravda* said on 26 October of that year: 'The man to whom the reactionary bourgeoisie awarded the Nobel Prize was one who had slandered socialist revolution and Soviet people.' Even Sholokhov, though unwillingly, felt forced to state his position by denouncing Pasternak as 'an internal emigré'.

Most ironic is the fact that not so many years later Sholokov himself gratefully accepted the Nobel Prize for Literature which he himself once condemned as having been awarded to 'an internal emigré'. Sholokhov and the small handful of modern revisionist writers whom he represents are now doing all they can to make the Soviet people believe that the nature of the Nobel Prize for Literature has changed and has become extraordinarily 'unbiased'. Speaking to a UPI correspondent, a leading member of the Union of Soviet Writers even had the impudence to describe the award as 'a great prize for socialist literature'. The central committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR also stepped forward and, in their own right, spoke of it as 'another proof of the world's recognition of the indisputable achievements of socialist-realist literature'.

Enough, worthy sorcerers! Brilliant though your sleight-of-hand may be, your extreme excitement arising from the unexpected flattery you feel about the Prize being awarded, Sholokhov has caused you to 'neglect' an important fact, namely, that Anders Osterling, Chairman of the Nobel Committee of the Swedish Academy, had already provided a public explanation of why they awarded him the Prize. And the reason is not that they had changed their position but that 'although Mr Sholokov is a convinced communist, he kept ideological comment completely out of his great, four-volume work', *Quiet Flows the Don*.

Well, now, have you not—you, the leaders of the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party and Ministers of the USSR Council of Ministers, you the important and the not so important commentators of the Soviet Union—have you not been making absolutely positive statements that the award of the Nobel Prize for Literature to Sholokhov shows 'recognition' of 'socialist-realist literature', and is 'a great prize for socialist literature'? Therefore, the truth now appears: your much advertised 'socialist literature' is the kind of literature, a literature so-called, 'with no ideological tendency' and 'standing above classes', that is encouraged by the capitalist class. You glibly profess to abide by Lenin's principles. Yet you have altogether forgotten these

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slogans of Lenin: 'Down with non-partisan writers! Down with literary supermen!' . . .

In fact, there is no such thing as literature that 'keeps out ideological comment completely', that 'stands above classes'. These are simply literary terms used by the capitalist class and the revisionists to fool readers, to mislead them and cover up the vicious purpose of serving imperialism and the bourgeoisie. In the present day world, all literature and art belong to a particular class and conform to a particular political line; hence, they necessarily conform to a particular ideology and have a particular political tendency. What the bourgeoisie and modern revisionists style as literature which is unrelated to ideology in reality spreads reactionary bourgeois ideology in a hundred and one ways and has a reactionary political tendency. . . .

With their own unique class sensitivity, the US bourgeois press has clearly detected the strong anti-communist consciousness of *Quiet Flows the Don* and has therefore given it high praise. When Sholokhov received the Nobel Prize for Literature, *The Saturday Review* wrote that this Russian prize-winner 'represents those very Don Cossacks who had fought against the Red Army', and that he 'has voiced through his fictional characters certain doubts about communist dogmas and practices'; it is not difficult to see that the reactionary western bourgeoisie bestowed favours on Sholokov just for this important reason and for no other.

It is worth considering more deeply why, when Sholokhov was previously put forward as a candidate for the Nobel Prize for Literature, twenty years ago (in 1946), the western bourgeoisie did not choose him at that time but only 'discovered' his 'talent' nineteen years later (in 1965). What is the key to this mystery?

When the mystery is resolved, the reason turns out to be very simple —before the Khrushchev revisionists usurped the leadership of the Soviet Union, Sholokhov anyhow was not so bold as to show himself fully in his true colours. Therefore, although the western bourgeoisie appraised his *Quiet Flows the Don* highly, they could not possibly trust him fully—consequently they took a 'wait and see' attitude. At that time, although Sholokhov had attacked revolutionary war and the October Revolution in his novel, yet willy nilly he still on occasions had to say something in praise of the October Revolution and of Stalin. Like Khrushchev, he called Stalin his 'Father'. When Stalin died in 1953, Sholokhov cried out in a hypocritical tone: 'Father, farewell, farewell forever, dear Father whom I warmly love throughout my life!' and he vowed to store up for Stalin 'sacred condolences forever in my heart'.

Yet within a very short period, at the twentieth congress of the CPSU in 1956, he publicly embraced Khrushchev who was madly opposing Stalin, and he colluded with Khrushchev in indiscriminate attacks on Fadeyev, one of the main leaders of the CPSU in the sphere

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of literature during the time when Stalin was the leader. Then he wrote his short story *The Fate of a Man*, which can be called a specimen of modern revisionist literature, and became Khrushchev's bellwether in spreading revisionism in the field of Soviet literature and art.

Soviet-US collaboration for the domination of the world is the very heart and soul of the Khrushchev revisionist line. This is why Sholokhov has become an enthusiastic propagandist for Soviet-US cultural co-operation among Soviet readers and in international cultural circles, and an eager trumpeter for Soviet-US cultural cooperation . . . And he has pleaded to US imperialism: 'Let us visit each other! We have nothing to argue about and no reason to fight one another!' Thus, at the European Conference of Writers, he appealed with all his might for writers to 'come to agreement' and 'find a common language' . . . just as the great statesmen and diplomats of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain were doing.

What is his motive? He is trying to protect the interests of the ruling clique in both the Soviet Union and the United States and he does not want people to rise up in revolution. Sholokhov is indiscriminately against every kind of war; when it comes to a revolutionary war of oppressed people or a war of liberation waged by an invaded nation, he always wants the writers of the world to be the first to rush forward and say 'no' and to speak up before those who say 'yes'. In short, he not only has turned traitor himself to revolution but does not want others to rise up in revolution. And he not only does not permit others to make revolutions but wants all writers in the world 'to unite' and 'collectively' forbid others to make revolutions.

These are the services for which Sholokhov has not only won the special favour of Khrushchev and his successors but prizes from the reactionary western bourgeoisie.

Sholokhov has already completely discarded the fig-leaf with which he covered his nakedness and stands revealed as a 'tool of the West'. The reactionary bourgeoisie has finally found a more useful 'traitor of the East' than Boris Pasternak.

Rebutting Simonov

Extracts from a speech by Liu Lu, student of Peking's Long March Middle School

Red Flag, 1 November 1966

There is a fellow in the Soviet Union called Simonov, a most dispicable creature and a renegade from the Soviet revolution. When Stalin died, he wrote: '. . . no words can express how we grieve over you, Comrade Stalin'. But the ink was hardly dry before, hard on the heels of Khrushchev, he joined in outrageously slandering, maligning, and attacking Stalin, in smearing the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, writing one long putrid revisionist piece after another,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reviling Stalin and the Soviet people, and thus becoming one of the chief abettors of the anti-Stalin campaign. It is no other than this representative of the high-salaried stratum, this new aristocrat of the Soviet bourgeoisie, who, on the pretext of commemorating Lu Hsun, wrote an article in the Soviet *Literary Gazette* of 18 October calumniating the great communist fighter Lu Hsun and attacking China's great proletarian cultural revolution. We will never tolerate the besmirching of the glorious name of Lu Hsun by such a renegade.

In this article, the lordly Simonov loudly proclaims that 'all that is happening in China now and is called the "cultural revolution" is a phenomenon that is alien to the people and transient.'

Chairman Mao has taught us that 'it is a bad thing if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy, for in that case it would mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy, since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue, since it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work.'

The lordly Simonovs allege that our cultural revolution is alien to them. It is only natural that our great proletarian cultural revolution should be alien to revisionists like you. You are flunkeys of imperialists, faithful sons of revisionists. We want to rebel against you. How could you possibly feel good about what we are doing? The torrent of the great proletarian cultural revolution is washing away completely the stinking, nauseating rubbish that you represent. Of course you are scared to death and mortally hate it. Do you dare to do as we are doing now and rouse the whole nation to put up posters in big characters giving full and frank expression of views and opinions, carry out a nationwide exchange of revolutionary experience and organise Red Guards? You dare not. You shudder with fear. If you dared to do it, you would not survive for a single day. All you are good for is to ride on the backs of the people, suck their blood and eat their flesh.

To be attacked by the enemy is not a bad thing but a good thing. If they praise us, will it not mean that we are working hand-in-glove with them?

You gentlemen, who are as stupid as asses, harbour the illusion that our revolution is 'transient'. You had better give up that idea! We, revolutionary Red Guards, are bent on carrying the great proletarian cultural revolution right through to the end. We are bent on rebelling against anything that is not in keeping with Mao Tse-tung's thought. We are bent on completely uprooting the poisonous shoots of imperialism and revisionism, and lifting them out by their roots.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are bent on fighting to the end, until all the demons and monsters in the world are completely wiped out, and we will not stop short of complete victory!

This gentleman Simonov rants frenziedly about our 'chorus of crude and unworthy anti-Soviet yells'. In actual fact, it is not we, but revisionists like Simonov and his like who, using their foul pens to blacken the glorious history of the Soviet people, are really anti-Soviet. Simonov and his like have written novels, made films, put on plays, and written poems defaming Stalin, the Soviet Red Army, and the Soviet people, presenting Soviet socialist society under the leadership of Stalin as a mess. Isn't all this a big anti-Soviet campaign? Isn't all this a most contemptible anti-Soviet campaign? In actual fact, today, it is the Soviet revisonist gentlemen who are voicing a chorus of crude and unworthy yells against China. You follow hard on the heels of American imperialism, yelling for all you are worth, and snapping at people at random, like rabid dogs. American imperialism says east and you dare not say west; American imperialism says the sun is black and you dare not say it is red. You tell lies everywhere, spread rumours everywhere, and everywhere engage in calumny and vilification, everywhere advertising your philosophy of survival and selling out the revolution, selling out the truth and everything else for the sake of a few crumbs. Everywhere you are chiming in with American imperialism and you are vainly trying to sell out the Vietnamese people's revolution to American imperialism. Some time ago, you cruelly suppressed the just demonstrations organised by revolutionary students of various countries studying in the Soviet Union, and the incidents resulted in serious bloodshed. Recently, you went further and drove home our students studying in the Soviet Union. By your words and actions you have proved yourselves the ringleaders of the anti-China chorus. It is you who are voicing 'a chorus of crude and unworthy yells' against China.

Simonov also rants about Lu Hsun's name 'sounding out louder and clearer'. Lu Hsun's name is sounding out louder and clearer because he was a vanguard fighter on the proletarian cultural front, the staunchest of revolutionary rebels, a man of unyielding integrity with the most clearly defined loves and hates and the firmest of principles. An abject renegade such as you has no right to mention Lu Hsun's name! We, Red Guards, give warning to you, Simonov, that your despicable efforts to take advantage of this occasion to discredit the Chinese people and advertise yourself will be fruitless. It is as the braying of a donkey, and it will be spurned by the revolutionary people. In Lu Hsun's presence, renegades like you should feel so ashamed of yourselves that you dare not show your faces.

We are the young red fighters of Chairman Mao, we are red rebels. Holding aloft the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought, using Mao Tse-tung's thought, this sharpest of weapons, and with

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lu Hsun as our model, we will carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end! We shall turn heaven and earth into realms of Mao Tse-tung's thought and arm all the people with it! We will plant the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought all over the world! We will make revolution to the end! We will rebel to the end! We will give our youth and blood for the world proletarian revolutionary cause!

We swear to carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end!

Be loyal for ever to Chairman Mao!
Be loyal for ever to Mao Tse-tung's thought!
Long live the great Communist Party of China!
Long life, long, long life to our great leader Chairman Mao!

Knowledge under a Ban

Extracts from an article by N. Lavrentiev

Uchitelskaya Gazeta, 20 October 1966

It is clear to everybody who has been following the development of events in China more or less attentively that the 'proletarian cultural revolution' is a direct consequence of the Chinese leaders' mistakes in domestic and foreign policy . . . and of their schismatic policy in the international communist and workers' movement which has led to the virtual isolation of the CPC from the vast majority of communist and workers' parties. This is also clear to those Chinese communists who know that it was not a study of quotations from Mao Tse-tung's works, but the comprehensive fraternal and disinterested aid of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries which made it possible for China to surmount the consequences of the revolutionary civil wars and of the war against imperialist Japan in a short period of time and to embark on the path of the construction of socialism. And it is also clear to those for whom creative Marxism-Leninism has not been replaced by Maoism, and who, guided by Marxist-Leninist doctrine, have drawn the correct conclusions concerning the fallaciousness of the course being pursued by China's ruling clique. They could not be convinced that it was sufficient to study the works of Mao Tse-tung in order to get out of the blind alley into which China had been led by its leaders. They could not be. The youth, ignorant of Marxism, could be. And it could be turned into a striking force directed against those who allow themselves to think with something other than quotations from Mao Tse-tung's works. But in order to do this the youth have to be protected from knowledge, which presupposes freedom of thought, by replacing this knowledge with the ideas of Mao Tse-tung. This is why the country's public education has become a target for the activists of the 'cultural revolution'.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Chinese central and provincial press is full of reports about people who are allegedly carrying out a 'bourgeois, revisionist' line in education. A typical example is the former chief editor of the evening newspaper, *Harbin Wan pao*, who was accused of holding incorrect views on education in China. The author of an article published in the provincial newspaper, *Heilungkiang Jih pao*, describes as a 'reactionary, absurd statement', his words to the effect that 'in the past, during the war, we found our support in the rifle, but now, during the construction of socialism, we are leaning upon knowledge', and that 'to respect knowledge means to respect the laws'. In the opinion of the author of the article, a party newspaper should not propagandise knowledge; its most 'basic task is the propogation of the ideas of Mao Tse-tung, the study of the ideas of Mao Tse-tung, the defence of the ideas of Mao Tse-tung, and the arming of the people with the ideas of Mao Tse-tung so that the ideas of Mao Tse-tung strike deep roots in the minds of the people'. The same newspaper criticised the former secretary of the Harbin city party committee because he declared that the country needed 'qualified specialists', and that educational institutions ought to educate 'builders of socialism who possess deep knowledge'.

And this is the way it is everywhere where an effort was made to solve the real problem of a genuine cultural revolution—the bringing of knowledge to the masses: in the universities, institutes, and secondary schools. Rectors, party committee secretaries, professors and teachers are being driven out of higher educational institutions; and directors and teachers who do not agree that Mao Tse-tung's ideas are capable of replacing the wealth of knowledge which has been developed by mankind are being driven out of secondary schools. Here, for example, is what was reported by the newspaper *Nan-fang Jih pao* about the situation in the Tenth School of the city of Kuangchow:

'With revolutionary courage, the activists of the party cell changed the current teaching system, stopped the teaching of such subjects as the native language and history, and began to regard the study and correct application of Chairman Mao's works in close connection with life as the most important subject. The cell mobilised the revolutionary teachers with the aim of having them help pupils at lessons in this subject to study Chairman Mao's conceptions about classes and the class war. . . .'

The newspaper portrays the pupils as 'great revolutionary warriors'. 'Armed with Mao Tse-tung's ideas, they possess the high powers of being able to distinguish aromatic flowers from poisonous weeds.' These heroes, the newspaper reports, unmasked the school teachers who, 'led by the school's acting party cell secretary, often held black meetings in the tea-room, and engaged in anti-party and anti-socialist activities. . . . they followed a bourgeois course, putting intellectual development in first place.'

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is difficult to believe that such a thing is possible in our time, and, moreover, in a socialist country which has the mission of carrying out a genuine cultural revolution. Nevertheless, this is a fact, and it is testified to by the resolution of the CC CPC and State Council concerning a 'reform of education' which was adopted 13 June 1966. In accordance with the resolution, admissions to higher educational institutions and secondary schools are being postponed for six months so that the youth will have enough time to carry out the 'cultural revolution' and to prepare for the way the new methods of admission will be applied. It is from these young people who have not begun their studies in educational institutions that the detachments of Red Guards were formed and sent to storm party committees under the slogan of a struggle against the 'four old ones': old culture, old customs, old morals, and old habits. In reality, this was a struggle precisely against those who did not wish to reconcile themselves to such old stuff, characteristic of feudal China, as the deification of a person or the rote-learning of canons which must be used as a guide in all life situations.

This resolution was followed by a communiqué on educational reform according to which admission to educational institutions will be made not on the basis of actual knowledge, but on the basis of 'fidelity to the ideas of Mao Tse-tung'. The period of education will be shortened, and the syllabus changed.

'It is necessary', wrote the *People's Daily*, 'to bury all the old teaching materials which contradict Mao Tse-tung's ideas in oblivion. The basis of the new teaching materials must be the ideas of Mao Tse-tung; in the elementary schools a collection of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's speeches will be studied in the first teaching period; a fuller collection . . . will be studied in the second teaching period; the collected works of Chairman Mao and others will be studied in second degree schools; the selected works of Chairman Mao will be studied in higher educational institutions'. . . .

All this bears witness to the fact that the training and education of the younger generation is dictated not by the interests of a cultural revolution, but by the selfish interests of the ruling clique whose egotistical aims, which are far from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, require not educated, thinking people, but people with brains which have been flattened down to a single level—fanatical worship of the personality and ideas of Mao Tse-tung. Everyone who does not correspond to this level is numbered among the 'revisionists', 'scum', and the 'black gang'. And the Red Guards are encouraged to revile a system of education which is based on the application of Soviet experience and to call it bourgeois because it enables us to see the world and evaluate phenomena, and to acquire and make use of knowledge, not from positions of Maoism, but from positions of Marxism-Leninism, not from chauvinist positions, but from positions of proletarian inter-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nationalism. They produce many posters similar to the 'indictment' made by the pupils of secondary school No. 1 in Changsha:

'The old educational system opens the doors wide to a continuation of the bourgeois line of education. Political activities, production work, and hours assigned to the study of Mao Tse-tung's ideas are often cut out for the sake of examination preparations. Last month only ten days were granted to students for participating in the great cultural revolution now taking place, and the remaining time was set aside for examination preparations . . . Encouraging youth to continue their studies further creates a favourable soil for the birth of revisionism.'

Pupils and students have received six months in which to participate in the 'great proletarian cultural revolution'. Schools and higher education institutions will be closed for six months in order to give free rein to the outrages of the Red Guards who are being encouraged by the Peking ruling clique in every possible way. As the declaration of the executive committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain stated: it is a 'revolution' aimed 'at the deification of Mao Tse-tung, at the smothering of creative thought, and at an attempt to liquidate any kind of opposition to the present dogmatic, fanatical, and anti-Soviet policy of the Chinese Communist Party leadership'.

From an article in *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, 27 October 1966, entitled 'Owing to the Cultural Revolution . . .'

Igor Dmitriev, Honoured Actor of the RSFSR, works in the Leningrad Drama Theatre named after Komissarzhevsky. He is known to the general movie-goer also from such films as The Quiet Don, Virgin Soil Upturned, Hamlet, and others. Recently, Dmitriev visited China with a tourist group. Our correspondent, G. Kozhukhov, asked Igor Borisovich to give an account of what he remembers of the trip. Today we are publishing his account.

For a start—two reservations. My impressions, no matter how fresh and immediate they may be, cannot make any claim to depth and general conclusiveness, for the simple reason that there was too little time for this. In addition, I am only going to talk about what is closest to me as a person who is involved in art. I even prepared for this trip in a purely utilitarian way: I read the appropriate literature and made an outline for myself beforehand of the requests I intended to make of my hosts. Basically, they came down to an acquaintance with the culture of the Chinese people.

Before departing for a country which was unknown to me, I read, specifically, Sergey Obraztsov's book which provides a clear notion of the classical Chinese theatre. This theatre is distinguished by the richness of its styles, and particularly by the synthetic art of its actors. They have an excellent mastery of plastic feeling, pantomime, rhythm,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vocalisation and movement. That is why the first thing I wanted to do was to visit a theatrical school. As a professional I was interested to find out just how the skill of welding together all the means of stage expressiveness is taught to an actor.

'Due to the cultural revolution'—this was the ground on which I was denied a visit to the actors' training school.

'Due to the cultural revolution' we were not shown the art museums and the famous collection of the Peking and Shao Hsing musical drama.

'Due to the cultural revolution' we were unable to meet the famous actor Chou Hsin-fang who, during a tour of our country several years ago, was applauded by Soviet audiences in the play 'A Fisherman's Revenge'.

As a matter of fact, I am simply not able to answer the question whether classical troupes, museums, well-known dramatists, artists, and actors exist in China today. In every case, our questions drew answers that were brief and evasive.

I will tell you about one play which I did after all get to see in Shanghai.

The theatre building—inside and outside—was pasted over with slogans, placards, and leaflets. Basically, they contained demands by the Red Guards to close down the professional troupes. They demanded that salaries no longer be paid to writers, artists and actors, for every one of them should earn his bread only by physical labour.

We asked for theatre programmes at a performance of the play 'Red Lantern' (it is about the struggle of the Chinese partisans against Japan during the war). But, unfortunately, there were none—it was explained to us that the Red Guards had abolished programmes. The audience, they say, should know the characters; as for who plays them —that's unimportant.

A few words about the play itself. I have already mentioned its theme. All the elements of the Peking musical drama were present in the manner of the performance. The characters carry on a dialogue, and then each sings his thoughts aloud. The director accents meanings with the help of music—drums or a gong. The elements of classical acting—the accentuated gesture, musical monologues, and also acrobatic tricks—combined with contemporary drama of everyday life, produce a quite complex impression.

Throughout the entire performance the footlights were hung with a placard inscribed in large characters: 'Let us seize the main criminals of this troupe by the scruff of the neck!' As an actor I found it somehow difficult to imagine how it was possible to play under such a slogan. . . .

At the intermission I asked permission from our escort to see my colleagues. Our group was approached during the act and told that the meeting would take place.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As we crossed the stage, I confess that I was excited. I wanted to speak sincerely, heart to heart, and to come to an understanding of something for myself. In the wings, lined up in the form of an angle and standing at attention, were the performers on the right, and the stage workers on the left. After realising that a discussion was excluded, I thanked my colleagues and expressed my hope for a stable friendship between our peoples and cultures. This phrase was applauded. Then, a return expression of gratitude for our kindness.

One detail. I was looking for an actor whom we had liked very much (he played the role of a Japanese intelligence officer), and only afterwards found him at the end of the line. It turned out that he does not have the right to stand beside performers of positive images.

That, perhaps, is everything new that I found out about the Chinese theatre.

My impressions of painting are scanty and contradictory. Here, for example, is one episode. In Peking there was an excursion to the former imperial summer palace. . . . We were guided through a splendid gallery 728 metres in length (the gates leading to it were formerly called the 'cloud' gates, but have now been renamed the 'anti-revisionist' gates). The gallery walls and beams were decorated by wonderful Chinese painting on the most diverse subjects. I was struck by the freshness of the colours. Suddenly we noticed that many paintings were painted over with white, and sometimes red paint. Some were crossed out with a black cross, and on some certain details were painted over.

We saw some young people who were walking in front of us with a step-ladder, pail and brush. I became interested in the principle: why are some paintings painted over and others not.

Here, for example, is a painting: a river, a junk sailing along it, on the junk a boatman, and . . . a white patch. It turned out that a richly dressed man had been standing beside the boatman. 'That is bourgeois painting,' it was explained to us.

We had occasion to be present at a crueller reprisal against a monument of past culture. A white pagoda stands in the centre of the Pei hai Park, and near it is an ancient tower completely faced with ceramic tiles. And they were being knocked out by several youths with picks and crow-bars. They then piled them into baskets and brought them down.

In Shanghai we were informed, as we were driving through the city, that we were about to see a monument to Pushkin which had been erected in 1937. This was a pleasant surprise. But when we arrived at the square only a pedestal pasted over with leaflets was standing there. There was no bust of the poet, but a Chinese flag was waving above the pedestal.

It was especially difficult for me, a Leningrader, to understand this.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I remember how during the siege of my native city, hungry, freezing and exhausted people buried the famous Klodtovsky steeds in order to save them from being bombed. And how later, when the steeds were brought from their refuge, all the Leningraders came to see them returned to the city—as an ornament, as history and as an imperishable monument of the national genius. For every people is great not only in its future, but also in its past. . . .

Recently, *Leningradskaya Pravda* published new materials on how the treasures of the Hermitage were saved during the last war. Among the materials is the story of how lovingly people managed to preserve, specifically, rare exhibits of Chinese painting.

How can these things be reconciled with those which I encountered in China? However, there is a great deal that is contradictory in that country now, and, frankly speaking, incomprehensible for us and patently unnatural. On the one hand, during all the 11 days of our journey, we met with a kind and friendly attitude on the part of simple Chinese workers, peasants, and employees. This is how it was at a cotton spinning factory in Peking, at an agricultural commune, and at a Shanghai metallurgical plant, where we inspected steel smelting and rolling mills.

On the other hand, we frequently encountered a rude and unfriendly attitude in Chinese propaganda towards our country, party, and people.

Perhaps my impressions are scrappy. I am deliberately not mentioning certain things which I had occasion to see. We were the involuntary eye-witnesses of episodes in which the chief *dramatis personae* were Red Guards who were sometimes dealing with the intelligentsia very cruelly. All this was quite incomprehensible to us, caused pain and perplexity, and did not fit in with our idea of a proper attitude towards art.

It is difficult to find an explanation for all these phenomena; I can testify to one thing: today's 'cultural revolution' is threatening ancient Chinese culture which for many, many centuries has been so carefully, so painstakingly, and so gratefully preserved by the Chinese people.

The 'Cultural Revolution', Art, and the 'Red Guards'

Literaturnaya Gazeta, 8 December 1966

In 1954, *the government of the People's Republic of China asked Soviet sculptors to design a monument embodying the friendship of the Soviet and Chinese peoples. This sculpture was to be erected in front of the Palace of Soviet-Chinese Friendship in Shanghai. The model submitted by the Soviet sculptors Professor Lev Yefimovich Kerbel and Lev Davydovich Muravin, was approved by the Chinese government, the Shanghai City Party Committee, and the present Foreign Minister Chen Yi. In March* 1955 *the monument was officially unveiled in the*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presence of the then Mayor of Shanghai, Chen Yi. The public gathered in the square were enthusiastic, chanting slogans in honour of Chinese-Soviet solidarity, the working class of the Soviet Union and of China, the unity of the Soviet and Chinese peoples. This was a festival of the friendship of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. The sculptors were decorated with Soviet-Chinese Friendship Medals.

As has now become known, 'Red Guards' have desecrated and wrecked the monument. The APN correspondents, A. Leonyan and Y. Ternova, interviewed the sculptors and asked them for their opinion.

L. Y. Kerbel: I was distressed when I read in the papers that the Red Guards had desecrated and wrecked the monument which was a symbol of Soviet-Chinese friendship. I think this was done on the orders of people who hate everything reasonable and good. While we were working on the monument, our Chinese comrades even said that it reflected Mao Tse-tung's well-known thought that the 'cannon-shots of the October Revolution carried Marxism-Leninism to China', and that the 'October Revolution had helped progressive elements all over the world and in China too to apply the proletarian outlook when determining the destiny of their country and deciding their own problems'. The destruction of this symbol of friendship leads us to the thought that those who ordered the Red Guards to wreck the monument betrayed the ideals of the Chinese revolution.

L. D. Muravin: In this monument we wanted to embody the great idea of the October Revolution—the fraternity of the peoples. The news that the Red Guards had destroyed the monument shocked me greatly. I was also very distressed to learn that they had decapitated the sculpture of the first great Chinese poet, Chu Yuan, who lived 340–278 B.C., desecrated the grave of the talented Chinese artist Chi Pai-shi, and torn down the Pushkin monument in Shanghai. . . . When you read about the so-called Red Guards movement you see how artificial it is. And everything that does not spring from life's truth is doomed to failure in the end. I have always been and still am an admirer of the old Chinese classic theatre and, in particular, the Peking opera, now banned. In China I became convinced that practically all the plays of the classic theatre were distinguished by their profound social truth. The people's will was always opposed to evil. This struggle was not something abstract to the audience. They lived through it themselves, displaying a lively interest in its outcome. The great Mei Lan-fang who, it seems, is not in favour either with the Red Guards, said: 'The Chinese classic theatre is a genuinely popular theatre, true to the traditions of our national art.' This art is of great world-wide significance. We can trace its influence even in the works of Vsevolod Meyerhold and other well-known directors. The news that the Chinese classic theatre had been banned grieved me greatly. It is bound to grieve all who hold dear the culture of mankind.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kerbel: The Red Guards are by no means the Chinese people. I shall never forget the days spent in China. There we saw for ourselves that the Chinese people highly value the culture of the past. It is bitter to read that the Red Guards have sacked the Peking museum which contained treasures of art that aroused the envy of the whole world . . . I shall never be able to understand how people can destroy memorials that are the pride not only of the Chinese, but of all mankind. The Red Guards movement comes near to vandalism. It displays the petty-bourgeois nihilism, inherent in Maoism, behind which in the final count lies a cowardly want of faith in the strength of the people. These bullies will leave an evil memory of themselves. We know that the Chinese people grieve at the loss of their national relics, their historical cultural monuments. . . .

Muravin: It is difficult to conceive how youngsters who have learned nothing and who know nothing declare themselves supreme judges and give the order: 'All pictures portraying the bamboo and other non-political subjects must be destroyed and the books of the poets burned.' Incidentally, I do not think that even by such methods it is possible to cut off Chinese classic poetry from the people. I have the impression that practically every other Chinese writes poetry. They know and love their poets. And I am sure that the efforts of the Red Guards and their leaders to make the Chinese people give up their poetry are in vain.

Kerbel: Lenin said that you could only become a communist when you had enriched your mind with a knowledge of all the wealth created by mankind. . . . The October Revolution flung open the doors of schools, universities, museums, exhibitions, to the whole of the people. In China they are trying to lock these doors, and that is called a 'cultural revolution!' Truly, there is neither revolution nor culture in this . . .

Muravin: We are profoundly concerned about the fate of China's outstanding artistic monuments, just as we are worried about the fate of the Italian art treasures that suffered as a result of a natural calamity. Incidentally, Soviet experts will take part in the restoration of these masterpieces . . .

In conclusion, Kerbel and Muravin said that while working for more than six months in China, they daily heard from Chinese comrades enthusiastic appraisals of the great fraternal aid which the Soviet Union had rendered them in the matter of building up a new life, strengthening their economy, and developing their science and culture. The sculptors emphasised that they were greatly surprised and outraged by the systematic anti-Soviet brainwashing to which the Chinese public is being subjected. With the whole of the Soviet people, they said, we wrathfully denounce the attempts of the Chinese leaders to extend their anti-Soviet activities.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESS

An Analysis of the Chinese Press

Extracts from an article by A. Dymkov

Sovetskaya Pechat, 1966, no. 12

The events in China in the course of the last few months are the result of an acute general political crisis in the Chinese leadership. Their significance, however, is not confined to China. Consciously or unconsciously, those who are conducting the 'cultural revolution' have become the inspiration of one of the largest anti-communist campaigns. Consciously or unconsciously, their efforts in fact result in an attempt to discredit socialism and communism throughout the world. Although historical experience bears witness to the fruitlessness of such attempts, these efforts by the leaders of an enormous country and an enormous party are immensely harmful.

The practical activity of the Chinese leaders strengthens the fabrications of capitalist propaganda. Moreover, these leaders solemnly proclaim as the alpha and omega of communism just those things which, for a long time, have appeared in the writings of bourgeois writers as a parody of communist society. . . . From 1961 on, the dosage of political and ideological falsification has increased from article to article. Those who today shout the infamous phrase about 'the USSR-USA plot' or 'the restoration of capitalism' in our country, would, even in 1962, have been horrified not only by these words, but even by such thoughts. However, even at that time the road to today's anti-Soviet slogans was being deliberately paved. It is a matter of a gradual increase in the dosage.

It is now obvious that having determined the basic direction—a daily increase in the anti-Soviet dose in open and limited publications, Chinese propaganda also planned a series of auxiliary lines. Let us briefly consider a few of them. . .

1. Negation of the Individual

. . . In contrast to Marxism, which considers the individual in a socialist society as an active part of it, as a conscious unit in a collective, as a pre-condition for the conscious creativity of the masses, the Chinese propagandists see in each individual merely a mindless tool without will or desires, a mere cog in a machine. Not the conscious creativity of the masses, but unconditional obedience is proclaimed as the decisive factor in the construction of socialism.

The 'theory' of the building of socialism by unthinking 'cogs' which will be manipulated in the right direction by one man, is incompatible with Leninism and is directed against it.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Chinese propagandists have created a dozen 'models' of such silent and obedient people, 'heroes' like Lei Fan and Wan Tse. They are famous for having written diaries by day and by night in which they glorified Chairman Mao, re-told dreams in which he appeared, and called for all his writings to be learned by heart. All that the 'cog' wants from life is oiling and the works of Chairman Mao provide the oil, they exclaimed. We swear to be eternally rustless 'cogs' of Chairman Mao.

Attempts are made in China to inculcate this 'cog' philosophy into the minds of individuals; it permeates the whole Chinese literature of the last few years and runs like a red thread from one article to the next. The press has persistently tried to instil into the reader the idea that the builder of socialism needs nothing, neither happiness, nor dreams, nor love. All this will be richly compensated by a frenetic reverence for Chairman Mao. The 'anti-love' propaganda has assumed, during these years, a particularly hard line. The youth paper *Chung-kuo Ch'ing-nien* instructed its readers as far back as 1963: 'At present it is very harmful to make a fetish of love. If love is considered the greatest happiness . . . it is possible to lose interest in socialism and to depart from communist morality.' The paper *Nanfan Jih-pao* enthusiastically tells the tale of Wan Yu-tsai who, 'while working in a warehouse had brought his bed there and stays there night and day, without returning home to his family'. In this way this outstanding warehouseman 'made his contribution to world revolution'. During all these years the central and provincial Chinese press has printed 'selections of readers' letters' denigrating love as a sentiment which lends wings to man. The idea was insidiously foisted on youth that love is practically a shameful thing and relations between the sexes merely a biological phenomenon.

An ideal 'cog' must be not only without feelings, but also without a ray of thought. The magazine *Chung-kuo Ch'ing-nien* quoted above (no. 19.1963), maintained that out of all Marxist literature and literature in general, only the writings of Chairman Mao should be studied. 'Only in those groups which have studied for a fairly long time, can some original works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin be also read, under the instruction of experienced propagandists.' However, the Red Guards would now consider such a statement the limit of revisionist impudence, as the appeal has gone forth to read only the works of Mao Tse-tung and to consign the rest of literature to the flames.

The Chinese press is insistently recommending the exclusive reading and study of Mao Tse-tung's works even to specialists in the natural sciences. Six months ago the medical journal *Ts'an-k'ao*, for instance, summing up a two-year long discussion by readers on the role of studying the ideas of Chairman Mao in medical practice, pointed out, in particular, that 'for correct diagnosis and treatment of illness one should be guided by the work of Mao Tse-tung *On Practice*'. The subtitle to one of the articles in *Kuan-ming Jih-pao* sounded no less

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expressive: 'Some practical deductions for the treatment of acute diabetes in conformity with the study of the works of Chairman Mao'. Some people who at present are trying to prove the correctness of such an approach to the problem, would have laughed at it only six years ago. However, man's sense of humour is being gradually killed by the drug of the cult and by continuous fear. We shall return to this later.

2. The Formulas of Incantation

The 'special' tasks of Chinese propagandists have given rise to methods for influencing the reader which, in fact, destroy whatever is useful in some of their slogans and appeals. Some of these methods are the demagogic formulations which must be rammed into the head of each 'cog'. One must do justice to Chinese propagandists; they have created a series of nearly classical formulas of dogmatic thought. Every young man, for instance, must take part in the movement of 'five goods', that is, be of good health, learn well, work well, have a good ideology, and strive for mutual help in production. None of these 'five goods' can be doubted. Each of them is really good. But is it possible that there is nothing good beyond the figure '5'? This number is a magical incantation! . . . Often a Chinese youth counting the 'five goods' on his fingers will frown painfully, trying to remember what he has left out, then give up, saying, 'Well, there are five altogether'. The 'cog' is simply not supposed to think. Even when awakened during the night he must answer the questions distinctly like an automaton:

What must we struggle for? For the five goods.
Against whom? Against three enemies.
And against whom else? Against three evils.
What must we strive for? For four searches.
How must we live? Three times eight.
What must we observe? Three disciplines.
What do we achieve? Eight hieroglyphs.
And what more? Four hieroglyphs.
What lights our way? Three red banners.

A selection of such formulas, together with a dozen quotations from the works of Chairman Mao, are supposed to serve instead of Marxist education.

One of the methods of 'influencing' the mass of readers in China is the reduction to absurdity of any, even outwardly sensible, thought. This method permits the gradual destruction of an independent critical point of view in any man, as being 'most dangerous' and 'most harmful'. When a man ceases to perceive that many statements repeated day in day out are ridiculous or simply silly, one can consider that the deed is done. He will follow any order blindly. . . .

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. Propaganda with a false bottom

As everybody knows, there are in China at least two kinds of press—the open press and one carefully screened from foreign eyes. In provincial towns, a foreigner who bought a local journal in an ordinary shop, would often be overtaken and would be categorically required to return the purchase. The journal turned out to be 'internal', that is, destined for Chinese readers only. While five years ago, for various jubilees and anniversaries of our country, the open papers and journals published descriptive articles without direct attacks on our party, the 'internal' press had already begun to defame Soviet reality. These closed publications are further divided into various kinds, from the journal sold in an ordinary shop to the curriculum notes in a university with the warning 'not to be taken out of the premises'. The most popular, if the expression can be used in this connection, is a small size paper *Ts'an-k'ao Hsiao-hsi*, whose circulation appears to be larger than the circulation of even the majority of open papers. Ostensibly this paper is supposed to instruct some categories of higher employees on materials contained in the capitalist press. But by 1961 it was already supposed to be studied, down to the very last line, by practically everybody in various state organisations and universities. It began to print exclusively anti-Soviet fabrications of right-wing bourgeois publications. These fabrications and rumours of similar political tenor were constantly repeated at meetings of the staff of enterprises and organisations. . . .

It must not be thought that the Chinese journalists did not show any resistance to this pressure from above. Of course many of them did not wish shamelessly to deceive their readers and tried to protest to the organisations instructing them. Their protests were, of course, disregarded. The anti-Soviet dosage in articles was increased by order from the centre.

Chinese journalists, editors, observers, and entire publications were *openly* accused of three basic sins:

(a) Insufficiently profound adulation of Mao Tse-tung.
(b) An attempt 'to deny that the teaching of Mao Tse-tung is the only contemporary guide in teaching'. Insufficiently firm emphasis on the fact that 'comrade Mao Tse-tung is the great teacher, the great leader, the great war leader, the great helmsman'.
(c) Insufficiently strident, 'too intelligent' anti-Soviet propaganda.

But apparently much more serious accusations have been levelled against these people. It seems that the resistance of people working on newspapers to the line which was being adopted was much sharper than could be deduced from the papers themselves. As can be seen from some accusations now published, this resistance continued over a number of years. All persecuted journalists were reminded of their earlier statements and actions. The editor of the provincial *Shensi*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jih-pao, Ting Chi-tsan, for instance, is accused of having printed in 1961 a report on the twenty-second congress of the CPSU in too large hieroglyphs, and also of having talked about the necessity to fight against 'profaning' Mao's ideas. He had said: 'At present the propaganda of creative study and application of the works of Chairman Mao has at times been boundlessly vulgarised. Should a ball player win his game, they say that the ideas of Mao Tse-tung played a part in it, but what sort of ideas of Mao Tse-tung could apply to ball games?' It is obvious that he and other journalists who have now been 'exposed', had serious objections not only to the methods used to establish the new course of leadership, but to the substance of the course itself.

Many of these persons were accused of 'undermining the revolutionary political and organisational line', of making 'mad attacks on the Big Leap and the People's Communes', and of attempts to 'diminish the glory of Mao Tse-tung'. There is indignation because some journalist or public figure said that the works of Mao Tse-tung must only be 'consulted' and not prayed to as to a Buddha; someone had been ironical about the careful study of the works of chairman Mao, thereby sabotaging the orders of comrade Lin Piao about the necessity of learning by heart quotations from the works of Chairman Mao.

In some cases the beating up of journalists is apparently directly connected with the beating up of the middle ranks in the party leadership, and reflects the struggle between rival groups. On orders from above the Red Guard also systematically persecute those journalists who, up till now, have not tried to express opinions which differ from official orders, but who are suspected of the ability to think for themselves. Apparently not only the existing opposition is being removed, but also persons who, by virtue of their political and general training, could create an opposition to the narrowly-nationalist, chauvinist course of Mao Tse-tung and his successors.

The Press Purge in China

Extracts from an article by M. Ivanov

Za Rubezhom, 13 October 1966

In the seventeen years following liberation, the Chinese press has never—in any political campaign—undergone such a crisis as the one it is going through now. Many newspapers and magazines have been shut down. Others have changed their names. The editorial staffs of a number of publications have been reorganised. The chief editors of many of these publications have been relieved.

Among others, Ting Chi-tsan, former chief editor of the newspaper *Shensi Daily*, was relieved of his post. In 1961, the report of the twenty-second CPSU congress 'was placed by him in a prominent place

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on page one and set up in especially large characters'. The issue of 21 September 1966 called this 'the glorification of the congress, enhancing of the authority of revisionism'. In describing the 1962 declaration of the Soviet government on support for China (in face of the Chiang Kai-shek forces' clamour about an invasion of the mainland) as 'sham support' and a 'false statement', the present editors have accused their former chief of placing the false statement in a prominent place on page one under large black characters. Nor did they forgive him his appeals for joint action with the Soviet Union in the fight against imperialism in January 1962. Ting Chi-tsan is also charged with making an open declaration, in a political report, to the effect that such a 'joint struggle' was a 'reliable guarantee against the imperialists starting a war'.

In a recent decision of the party committee of Shensi province, Ting Chi-tsan was relieved of his post as chief editor of the *Shensi Daily* as 'being in a position of authority and in the party, but following the capitalist path', and as a 'counter-revolutionary revisionist element' . . .

Among other 'crimes', the newspaper names his aspersions on the 'general line', the 'great leap forward', and the 'people's communes'. He stated: 'one may doubt the successes of the great leap forward; it was a departure from objective laws'. The paper also writes that he said: 'In socialist construction we have made innumerable mistakes'; 'the building of socialism in our country resembles the search for the right path in a complex and confused labyrinth': 'the party proceeds not from reality but rather on the basis of subjective wishes', and 'reckons only with the demands' but 'does not reckon with the possibilities'.

The 'cultural revolution' has not bypassed many other editors of press organs of provincial and city committees of the Chinese Communist Party. Chung Lin, chief editor of the newspaper *Kwangsi Daily*, has also been removed from his post and subjected to criticism. As in the case of hundreds of other 'anti-party, anti-socialist elements', he is accused of 'speaking out against the dissemination of the ideas of Mao Tse-tung'. He said that the books of Chairman Mao are not 'divine'. . . .

The entire editorial staff of the newspaper *Yunnan Daily* has been reorganised. Its functions in the newspaper were taken over by a 'cultural revolution work group.' In time, a completely new editorial staff was appointed. Li Meng-pai was removed as chief editor. The *Yunnan Daily* called him a 'representative of the bourgeoisie in communist clothing', and a 'thoroughgoing revisionist who directed his attacks against the CC of the party and Chairman Mao, against the ideas of Mao Tse-tung'. . . .

The Harbin evening newspaper *Harbin Wan-Pao*, organ of the Harbin city committee of the Communist Party, has been accused of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'anti-party, anti-socialist activity' and its chief editor, Chiang Tsung, has been removed. . . .

The chief editor of the newspaper *Ching-Hai Jih-Pao* has been removed. Even the editor of the Tibetan *Hsi-Tsang Jih-Pao* has come under criticism, though this newspaper has always been distinguished by the fact that its columns were always filled by communiqués of the New China News Agency and editorials from the Peking *People's Daily*. . . .

The 'cultural revolution' has deprived many press organs of their writers and artists as well. For several months now, subscribers have not been receiving the literary journal *Weni Pao*, or the journal of literary criticism *Wen-Hsiuh Ping-Lung* (organs of the Union of Chinese Writers). The following have been closed down: the socio-political weekly *Shih-Tse Chih-Shih*, the journals *The Study of International Problems*, *New Construction*, and *Practice*—the theoretical organ of the party committee of the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Republic, etc.

Chungo Shao-Yen Pao, the newspaper of the Chinese pioneers, and the journal *Hung-ling-ching* (Red Necktie) have ceased publication.

Press Conference by Journalists Expelled from China (extracts)

Moscow Radio, 7 January 1967

Statements recorded at the Journalists Central House in Moscow by the Izvestiya, Komsomolskaya Pravda, *and Tass correspondents, Yuri Kosyukov, Andrey Krushinsky, and Grigory Arslanov, who were recently expelled from China.*

Announcer: There exists among journalists an unwritten law that no journalist ever uses an interview obtained by a colleague and even the most hardened journalist tries to avoid giving an address at a press conference. The job of representatives of the press, radio, or television, is to cover with the maximum of objectivity and argumentation those events of which he is a witness. It was precisely in this way that the three Soviet journalists, Yuri Kosyukov, Andrey Krushinsky, and Grigory Arslanov, acted in China. In their dispatches they reported what was happening at the time in China, and the Chinese press, starting with the central newspapers and ending with all kinds of publications of the Red Guards, was the chief source of their information. Despite this, however, the Chinese authorities brought against these three Soviet journalists a trumped-up charge that they had published lies and slander about the so-called cultural revolution. These assertions served as the pretext for Peking's ultimatum for the recall of the three Soviet correspondents. This clearly discriminatory act is the reason for the organisation today of this press conference, at which they will tell their Soviet and foreign colleagues about the conditions in which they had to work in China. . . .

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kosyukov: First of all I should like to stress that the demand of the Foreign Ministry of the Chinese People's Republic (CPR) concerning the recall from Peking of we three Soviet journalists was not in itself unexpected; it was simply another wearisome link in a long chain of foreign policy acts by the Chinese leaders directed at a further deterioration in relations between the Soviet Union and China, and at undermining the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the CPR.

The series of provocations outside the Soviet Embassy in Peking, the destruction by the Red Guards of the few remaining memorials and monuments of Soviet-Chinese friendship, the illegal detention and arrest of the Soviet ship Zagorsk—these represent the cumulative effect of what has been going on throughout 1966 when Mao Tse-tung and his supporters exalted their anti-Soviet course to the level of official policy and declared the CPSU and the Soviet State to be Public Enemy No. 1. As you know, the Chinese side justified its demands by saying that we had slandered their great, proletarian, cultural revolution. Since the spokesman of the CPR Foreign Ministry was unable to cite a single specific example to give credence to this accusation, we consider it necessary to dwell in somewhat greater detail on this question.

The Soviet journalists informed the public of their country on the basis of reliable, objective facts. As far as the CPR is concerned, the Soviet correspondents always expressed the interests of friendship between our peoples, and with this sentiment of proletarian internationalism they fulfilled their duty as journalists. This was also mentioned more than once by Chinese officials, who stated that the Soviet journalists were making a contribution to the cause of strengthening Soviet-Chinese friendship.

What has now prompted the Chinese officials to make a directly opposite statement? Obviously, the fact that Soviet journalists, faithful to their rule to speak the truth, from the very beginning put in inverted commas their references to the routine political campaign which is extravagantly called a 'spontaneous great proletarian cultural revolution'. Among other inventions by the Chinese side, attention must be drawn to yet another accusation. The spokesman of the CPR Foreign Ministry alleged that the Soviet journalists had for a long time ignored facilities at their disposal. This person also deliberately tried to present black as white. Had he forgotten that since 1963 the majority of applications by Soviet journalists to visit various parts of the country had remained unanswered? I personally was not allowed to visit Szechwan, Yunnan, Heilungkiang, although previously these provinces had been visited by western correspondents. Moreover, officials of the press department did not seem to consider it necessary to reply to our applications. When permission was given to visit industrial enterprises, a commune, or an educational institution, the organisation of such visits, to put it mildly, left much to be desired.

It is obvious that he idea of the exacerbation of the class struggle

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the world moves towards socialism, which has been rejected by the world communist movement, has been finally adopted by China, but it is also obvious that the broad popular masses are becoming increasingly convinced that this course is erroneous. This is shown, in particular, by more frequent strikes, demonstrations, and clashes with the Red Guards and by protests by the Chinese working people against the cultural revolution. . . .

Arslanov: If you followed the reports of Soviet correspondents from Peking, you must have noticed that the information the Soviet correspondents gave was always based on documentary evidence, with the source given. It is true, we often had to rely on information from the Red Guards, their leaflets, even their papers, but we had to inform the Soviet reader about what was taking place in the CPR. How is it possible, for example, to be silent about the disbandment of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions; about the attacks of Red Guards on the party and state establishments; or about the closing down of central and provincial newspapers? We were bound to report the conduct of the million-strong army of Red Guards, and the young people torn away from school desks and lecture rooms. . . .

Krushinsky: A deliberate policy of limitation of information is to be seen in every Peking newspaper and in every broadcast on radio or television. Chinese young people do not know that the Soviet people aid Vietnam, they do not know the names of our cosmonauts, or the tempo of the development of our Soviet economy; nor do they know about the development of their own economy, because figures on this have not been published in China since 1959. The domestic and external propaganda of the Chinese leadership is based on lies and distortion. The Press Department of the CPR Ministry of Foreign Affairs did not deny, and could not deny, any of the reports sent by the Soviet correspondents. Our reports were based on facts.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CULTURAL EXCHANGES

Why the Visit was Interrupted

Press Conference by Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society Delegation on their Return from China (extracts)

Pravda, 22 November 1966

The Large Hall of Friendship House in Moscow on 21 November was the scene of a press conference held by members of the delegation of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, which, as we know, cut short their visit to China and returned home earlier than planned.

The leader of the delegation, *Pravda* commentator V. V. Mayevsky, made a statement to the Soviet and foreign correspondents.

The delegation of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, he declared, which arrived in the People's Republic of China on 2 November at the invitation of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society, was forced to interrupt the visit on 18 November and return home.

In this connection, the delegation deems it necessary to bring to public notice facts which evoked our deep indignation and forced us to adopt the decision to leave China.

The delegation travelled to China . . . to participate in activities commemorating the 49th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

We set off with hopes of meeting representatives of the Chinese public, getting acquainted with the life of the industrious and talented Chinese people, towards whom we entertain sentiments of sincere respect, and telling the working people of China about the Soviet Union. This visit was meant to develop ties between the Friendship Societies of the two countries, to strengthen the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

We, naturally, were aware that the present situation in China, linked with the so-called cultural revolution and imbued with ever-increasing great-power chauvinism, personality cult, and deliberately fanned hostility towards the socialist countries, and, first of all, towards the Soviet Union, could leave a certain imprint on our visit.

It was precisely for this reason that our delegation, from the very first day of its stay, refrained from making any critical remarks about the policy of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, even though the members of the delegation did have something to say in this matter. We realised that our task was not to aggravate the situation, tense as it is, but to promote understanding and friendship between our peoples. We, naturally, figured that our hosts would appreciate this stand, and, in keeping with the elementary rules of hospitality, would not permit themselves any actions aimed against the Soviet

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union, and would create normal conditions for the work of the delegation.

Unfortunately, these hopes were not realised.

While in China, the delegation of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society found itself in extremely difficult conditions: a hostile atmosphere was whipped up around us . . . On 4 November the delegation was invited to a sculpture exhibition . . . Soon after the delegation had arrived there, groups of 'Red Guards', who filled the hall, started at someone's command to chant anti-Soviet slogans. We had to walk out of the exhibition. On the same day anti-Soviet slogans appeared on the walls and on the pavement at the entrance to the hotel where we were staying.

On 7 November, the 49th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the day sacred to every Soviet citizen, to every communist, our delegation became an object of a new outrageous provocation. We visited the Peking University, known as the citadel of the 'cultural revolution'. We did not hear there either congratulations on the anniversary of the October Revolution, or assurances of the readiness to strengthen the friendship between the peoples of our two countries. Instead, we heard slanderous pronouncements about some kind of 'Soviet revisionists', attacks on the CPSU and the Soviet people. We could not put up with these insults, and, having voiced our protest, walked out of the room where the talk took place . . .

In the evening of 7 November, when a reception devoted to the anniversary of the October Revolution was over in the Soviet Embassy, the delegation could not drive from the embassy territory through the main gates because they were blocked by a crowd of 'Red Guards' who systematically commit outrages there.

The delegation's stay in Shanghai passed in a comparatively normal atmosphere, and we would like to attribute this to the understanding shown by the representatives of the Shanghai branch of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society. In addition to this in Shanghai we mainly visited industrial enterprises and a people's commune; there are no 'Red Guard' organisations there. In such places people work in order to feed the country and the organisers of anti-Soviet sorties could hardly count on support. Nevertheless here as well some of the people accompanying our delegation attempted to slander the Soviet Union . . .

We could also cite other facts but this is not a matter of their number. The Soviet delegation time and again pointed out to the representatives of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society who accompanied us that it considered the slanderous anti-Soviet attacks an insult to our delegation and our people who are closely rallied around the Leninist Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. We time and again protested against actions hostile to the Soviet Union and aimed at undermining Soviet-Chinese friendship. These protests, however, were not taken into account. Indeed, one representative of the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kwantung branch of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society cynically said: 'I wouldn't give a penny for your protests.'

Under these conditions the Soviet delegation while in Kwangchow had no other choice than to declare that it was discontinuing its trip and was returning to Peking. In reply to this Kang Chi-min, the representative of the Central Board of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society who accompanied the delegation, once again resorted to slander and coarse abuse. He even attempted to draw a parallel between the Soviet Union and Hitler fascism. When the delegation in protest against these monstrous insults refused to continue the talk the representatives of the Chinese side resorted to rude insults against the delegation and shouted anti-Soviet slogans.

On their return to Peking members of the delegation informed the leading officials of the Central Board of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society of the above-mentioned facts . . . The delegation declared that if anti-Soviet provocations against us were not stopped and if normal conditions were not provided for our stay in China, we would have to cut short our visit and return home. We asked the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society to give clear-cut guarantees that the anti-Soviet provocations would not be repeated . . . But the leading officials of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society, far from condemning the hostile actions against the delegation, justified them. More, they made new attacks against our party and the policy of the Soviet Union and threatened us. It became evident that the anti-Soviet provocations of some of the Chinese-Soviet Friendship Society workers logically followed from the positions of its leaders.

The delegation stated that in the situation that had arisen it was compelled to cut short its visit . . . On 19 November our delegation returned home.

The delegation regrets that we had to cut short our visit to China. We did everything to avoid this. However, the frustration of the work of our delegation was apparently planned by those who seek to undermine friendship between the peoples of our countries and who dread any contacts between Soviet and Chinese people.

Our delegation declares:

We vigorously reject the slanderous statements made in China with respect to our Party and our state . . . We regard as shameful the efforts of some persons in the People's Republic of China to undermine the unity between the Soviet people, our glorious Communist Party and the Soviet Government. The all-conquering force of the monolithic unity of the family of the Soviet peoples, the CPSU and our Government, has been proved by the course of history.

We most vigorously condemn the shameful actions of people who, while paying lip service to the struggle against imperialism, actually come out against the unification of all anti-imperialist forces and thus stand in the way of intensifying resistance to the US aggressors in

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vietnam; of those people who are splitting the world communist movement, struggling against the Soviet Union, rendering by all these actions an inestimable service to the foes of the revolution, socialism, and peace, and discrediting the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism and socialism.

The members of the delegation once again reaffirm their profound faith in that the Chinese working people and Chinese Communists will, in defiance of all difficulties, march in one rank with their class and party brothers, in one mighty front of struggle against the imperialist aggressors and oppressors, for socialism, peace, progress, culture, and the happiness of working men.

We have faith in the bright future ahead of the Chinese people, in the fraternal friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and China. Though our stay in China was complicated in every possible way, we nevertheless felt that the working people of China entertain sentiments of deep sympathy and friendship for the Soviet Union.

The delegation expresses the warmest gratitude to all those in the People's Republic of China who sincerely tried to help us in our work, thus contributing to the friendship between our two peoples. We are availing ourselves of this occasion to pass on hearty, friendly greetings to the Chinese people.

Soviet Revisionists Turn Truth Upside Down in Anti-China Clamour

Truth about Suspension of Soviet-Chinese Friendship Association Delegation's Visit to China (extracts)

Peking Review, 23 December 1966

After creating an incident by unreasonably suspending the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Association delegation's visit to China, the Soviet revisionist leading clique has recently tried to foist the blame on to China, using its propaganda machine to distort the facts and turn the truth upside down. It has made a big to-do of this incident in order to attack China. Kang Chi-min, Council Member of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Association, who accompanied the delegation throughout the time it was in China, has revealed the facts about the unreasonable suspension of the visit by the delegation and sternly refuted the slanders of the Soviet side.

Warm and Friendly Hospitality Throughout by Chinese Side

Kang Chi-min said that the delegation of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Association led by Victor Vasilievich Mayevsky, a *Pravda* commentator, came to China on 2 November at the invitation of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Association to take part in the activities of the Chinese people celebrating the 49th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and to pay a friendly visit in accordance with the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1966 co-operation plan between the two friendship associations. The Sino-Soviet Friendship Association and other institutions concerned follow the consistent teachings of the Chinese people's great leader Chairman Mao, so, treasuring and safeguarding—as they always do—the friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, they gave warm and friendly hospitality to the Soviet delegation throughout its visit and did all they could to provide it with the best of facilities. During the delegation's brief visit of just 15 days, from 2 November, the day it arrived, until 17 November, the day it unreasonably cut short its visit, the Chinese side arranged visits to Peking, Shanghai and Kwangchow in accordance with the wishes of the delegation and after consultations by both sides. In Peking, the delegation attended the meeting in celebration of the 49th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. In Peking and other places it visited four factories, two rural people's communes, four museums, two big exhibitions on achievements in industry and agriculture, in addition to visits to libraries, workers' cultural palaces, nurseries and other places. In accordance with the requests of the delegation the Chinese side arranged meetings for them with revolutionary students and teachers of colleges and middle schools, and Red Guards. They had discussions with Chinese writers and met activists of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Association. They also had wide contacts with thousands upon thousands of Chinese workers, peasants and people from all circles. Because of their profound friendship for the Soviet people, the Chinese people everywhere accorded the delegation the warmest welcome. When the Soviet delegation appeared for the first time in Tien An Men Square, a large group of Red Guards gathered around them. Many rushed forward to shake hands warmly and asked the Soviet guests to convey their best regards to the great Soviet people. During the visit to the Huang-tukang People's Commune, in the suburbs of Peking, the commune members cordially invited the delegation members to visit their homes. Some of them chatted with the commune members like old friends and they encouraged each other 'to give the younger generation a good education and never to forget the past'. In Shanghai, a member of the delegation, a worker, was having a hearty talk with a Chinese worker and was reluctant to leave but was pulled away by Mayevsky. These are iron-clad facts which Mayevsky can remember as the events described were striking and quite recent. But when the delegation returned to the Soviet Union, Mayevsky talked utter nonsense. Distorting the facts, he said that as soon as the Soviet delegation arrived in China it was 'placed under extremely difficult conditions' and was 'surrounded with an antagonistic atmosphere'. In saying this, Mayevsky was trying to stir up anti-Chinese sentiments among the Soviet people.

Repeated Provocations by Mayevsky and Others

Citing many facts, Kang Chi-min told how Mayevsky and his group, on many occasions, picked quarrels and even openly interfered in

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China's internal affairs and attacked China's great proletarian cultural revolution and foreign policy.

At a discussion with the Red Guards of higher educational institutions and middle schools in Peking concerning the great cultural revolution in China, Mayevsky and his group asked them scores of questions, including many that were obviously very unfriendly. Though disapproving of the attitude of Mayevsky and his group, the Chinese Red Guards, treasuring the friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, nevertheless, did all they could to restrain themselves and answered each question calmly. However, Mayevsky and certain other delegation members created an additional provocation when they openly slandered China's great cultural revolution by saying that it was 'destroying culture' and 'had no connection at all with the proletarian revolution'. The Red Guards, their patience tried too far, refuted these statements by presenting the facts. Mayevsky then brazenly charged the Red Guards with being 'anti-Soviet', and headed a demonstrative walk-out. He later lodged a most unreasonable 'protest' with functionaries of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Association.

On the evening of 7 November, the delegation attended the reception given by the Soviet Embassy in China to celebrate the 49th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. When the reception was over, several hundred revolutionary students and teachers and Red Guards from higher educational institutions in Peking spontaneously gathered on the road in front of the Embassy to celebrate this glorious festival of the proletariat and the revolutionary people of the whole world. The Red Guard who presided over this gathering stated: 'With feelings of infinite respect for the glorious October Revolution, boundless love for the great Soviet people, and immense indignation against modern revisionism, we warmly celebrate the 49th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.' The Red Guards read out the message of greetings from the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress and the State Council addressed to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union. They cheered again and again: 'Long live the Great October Socialist Revolution!' 'Long live the great Soviet people!' 'Long live the unbreakable friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union!' and 'Down with modern revisionism!' This gathering, notable for the enormous revolutionary enthusiasm of the young Red Guard fighters, proceeded with great warmth and in perfect order. Mayevsky, however, ignored the facts and openly slandered the Chinese Red Guards as having 'acted recklessly' and staged 'anti-Soviet provocations' in front of the Soviet Embassy that evening.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ignored the Chinese Side's Advice and Arbitrarily Ended their Visit to China

The delegation visited China at a time when all the Chinese students in the Soviet Union had unjustifiably been ordered to leave by the Soviet Government. The Chinese revolutionary masses and Red Guards, in their anger, lodged the strongest protests with the Soviet revisionist leading clique against their criminal act to deliberately strain Sino-Soviet relations. In this situation, Mayevsky and his group not only refused to examine their own activities, but on the contrary, misrepresented the Chinese people's opposition to the Soviet revisionist leading clique as 'opposition to the Soviet people' and 'anti-Soviet'. They did this by standing the truth on its head and turning right into wrong. . . .

When the delegation wanted to end their visit, responsible members of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Association asked them many times to stay on. But Mayevsky and his group stubbornly rejected this advice. They continued to create provocations and act in an arbitrary manner. During their tour of China, on four occasions they left places in the middle of their visits; on four occasions they refused to carry out the arrangements made after consultations between both sides; on five occasions they lodged 'protests' with the Chinese side without reason and twice issued statements threatening to terminate their whole visit. Finally, they went so far as to decide unilaterally and capriciously to end their visit and leave China ahead of schedule. . . .

At their press conference, Mayevsky and his group fabricated a flood of lies and made venemous anti-Chinese statements; they directed the spearhead of their attack against Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the great leader of the Chinese people and of the revolutionary people of the world. Ignoring the fact that the 700 million Chinese people and the revolutionary people of the whole world have a boundless love and esteem for their great leader Chairman Mao and Mao Tse-tung's thought, they went to all lengths in slandering the Chinese people's mass movement to study and apply Chairman Mao's works in a creative way as 'the worship of a god'. . .

Kang Chi-min emphasised that what Mayevsky and his group had done during their visit to China and on their return home fully demonstrated that the stopping of the visit by the delegation was a grave and premeditated anti-China incident organised and planned by the Soviet revisionist leading clique with the aim of further worsening Sino-Soviet relations and undermining the traditional friendship between the peoples of the two countries. They could not deny the countless iron-clad facts proving this.

Kang Chi-min said that the Soviet revisionist leading clique that has stepped into Khrushchev's shoes is practising Khrushchevism without Khrushchev and has been going farther and farther along the road of colluding with the United States in opposing China. They have sunk to the lowest depths in their attempt to whip up a new anti-China

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wave, curry favour with US imperialism and realise their dream of so-called 'Soviet-US cooperation' for world domination. . . .

In conclusion Kang Chi-min said that the 700 million Chinese people, taught by our great leader Chairman Mao and the Chinese Communist Party, will always be friends with the Soviet people who have been nurtured by the great Lenin. The friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples is eternal and cannot be disrupted by anyone. The anti-China clamour of the Soviet revisionist leading clique and its flunkeys is no more than a dark spot on the face of the sun, it can never blot out the radiance of the great friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples.

Students leave China (extracts)

Komsomolskaya Pravda, 9 October 1966

A narrow hallway of the student dormitory. As in any Chinese establishment, the walls are covered with coloured paper bearing quotations from the works of Mao Tse-tung. But the doors are unusual for Peking. On almost all there is a photograph which means much more than mere decoration. . . . Here is a photograph of Mao Tse-tung—behind this door live Red Guards. . . . A photograph of the immortal Nguyen Wan-choi—students from Vietnam live here. . . . A photograph of the Soviet pennant sent into space; this is no. 422, the room of Soviet students. . . .

I was in the student dormitory on the last day when Abdusattar and his classmate Viktor Usov bade farewell to room 422. For over two years they had studied at Peking's Language Institute and now the Institute's directors had, as in all other Chinese higher educational institutions, asked foreign students to leave the CPR. 'There will be no studies', they explained. 'Instructors are busy with the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.'

For Soviet students and trainees the last months in China were not easy. Trainee Aleksey Zhelokhovtsev, studying ancient Chinese literature at the Peking Pedagogical Institute, had several times changed advisers because they were exposed as 'anti-party black bandits'. Aleksey had to prepare for each trip to the library as if for diplomatic talks, obtaining in advance written proof about availability in the library of one book or another because even ancient novels are here covered by a cloak of secrecy. The nervous environment of the 'Cultural Revolution' had its effect on more than just studies. Soviet students not infrequently heard direct threats from 'revolutionary students'. Red Guards were prompted to use the wall in the hallway across from Room 422 for the most pronounced anti-Soviet proclamations.

The farewell evening, which formally honoured the seventeenth anniversary of the Chinese People's Republic and was organised at the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peking Language Institute, also followed an anti-Soviet script. It began with the organisers of the evening trying to force all foreign students, including our fellows, to recite passages from Mao Tse-tung in unison. Then one of the local pioneers of the 'Cultural Revolution' began a speech full of vicious anti-Soviet attacks. What followed, the fellows don't know—they thought it better to leave the hall where this provocative performance was being staged. 'Good boys, you acted correctly', they were told the next morning by one of the Latin American students. 'I envy you. Even though you are leaving, you will be able to continue your studies in Moscow'. . .

In the evening, before the five Soviet students and trainees got on the Peking-Moscow train, I asked them whether they were happy about leaving. Abdusattar told me: 'Like the others, I of course miss the Fatherland. But we all have a feeling of great regret about this unexpected interruption in our studies. We all studied the Chinese language, the literature and art of the great Chinese people, with great enthusiasm here. When we return to Moscow we will continue studying our subject with the same enthusiasm. And I hope that the day will come when we will again be able to come to China to study'. . .

Victor Usov said: 'Through the irony of fate, when I was only planning to go to China, I wanted to choose as the subject for my diploma the cultural revolution in the CPR. Of course, I did not have in mind the present "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" but the one which the Chinese people had during the first years of development of their republic, and which tackled illiteracy and was beginning to train cadres of the people's intelligentsia. When I arrived in Peking my ambition to study this question was not encouraged. In recent months it became clear why'. . .

Today on the door of Room 422 there is no longer the photograph of the Soviet pennant. A little time will go by and there will remain nothing in this student hallway except portraits of Mao Tse-tung.

Talk with Soviet students returned from China (extracts)

Bakinski Rabochi, 20 November 1966

On 20 September, the Chinese Ministry of Higher Education, in violation of the principle of reciprocity in regard to the exchange of students, graduate students, and teachers provided for under the agreement on Cultural Collaboration between the USSR and the Chinese People's Republic of 5 July 1966, and the plan for cultural collaboration between both nations for 1966, unilaterally interrupted the studies of Soviet students and trainees and demanded that they leave China for the Soviet Union within 10–15 days. This action has harmed the training of Soviet students and trainees, and also the further development of collaboration between both nations in this field.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At present all the Soviet students and trainees have returned from the Chinese People's Republic to the motherland, where they are continuing their studies and research work at institutes.

Correspondents of the Novosti Press Agency asked some of them to share their impressions and observations made during their stay in China.

Aleksey Nikolaevich Zhelokhovtsev (junior scientific worker at the Institute for the Peoples of Asia under the USSR Academy of Sciences), in conversation with a correspondent from the Novosti New Agency, said:

I have been studying Chinese literature and language for fourteen years. During this time I have been able to visit China twice—the first time in 1958 and the second time in accordance with the agreement on Cultural Collaboration between the USSR and the Chinese People's Republic under an exchange programme during the present year. The study of Chinese literature is a broad and difficult area, and people who devote themselves to it should, in the first place, be able to consult regularly with Chinese specialists, and, secondly, have access to the ancient Chinese relics and catalogues. I greatly regret that the 'cultural revolution' deprived me of the possibility of completing an extremely interesting 10-month programme of studying the ancient philosophical descriptive prose.

Question: Who directed your work?

Answer: Professor Ko Yu-heng, deputy dean of the philological faculty at the Pedagogical Institute. The professor helped me not only to understand the texts but also gave lectures. Unfortunately, in July our studies were interrupted. The professor was condemned and declared a 'hostile element'. I should point out that immediately upon my arrival in China, I felt in a very strange situation. I was surrounded by a wall of silence. This was because the Chinese had been forbidden to speak with foreigners, particularly with students and trainees from the Soviet Union. I was forced to make a protest because, living in China, I didn't even have conversation practice. After this I was allowed to attend lectures with the fifth year students. The lectures were very interesting, but soon they were stopped because all the students had to participate in the 'cultural revolution'. In July, our library ceased operating, and I had no opportunity of continuing my studies in accordance with the programme worked out by the Chinese side during my stay in China. . . .

Question: Were you able to entertain your Soviet comrades studying in other institutes of Peking in your dormitory, and exchange opinions with them on the course of your work?

Answer: No. The Chinese authorities did not permit me to entertain Soviet comrades or to visit them.

Question: Were you able to meet the representatives of the Chinese intelligentsia?

Answer: No. I asked the Chinese authorities to allow me to meet

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Li Hsi-fang, a literary critic working in the central committee of the CCP. Before my departure for China, I had reviewed his book on ancient Chinese literature. The review was published in *Narody Azii i Afriki* in 1964. I was told that this question had to be discussed. I also requested a meeting with the film director Chang Shui-hua, who directed the film 'The Grey-Haired Girl' and with whom I had worked as a translator in 1958. I was told that this question also would be discussed. I requested permission to visit the Chinese literary critic and literary historian Keng I-chung. He is a major specialist on the artistic literature of the Sung and Ming eras. I reviewed his book this year. Again I was told that this question had to be discussed. And none of my requests for meetings with Chinese colleagues was granted. . . .

Question: Who officially said that the Chinese authorities did not wish you to complete your 10-month programme?

Answer: The Chinese Minister of Higher Education officially announced this to our embassy in Peking in September. Two weeks before the date of my departure set by the Chinese authorities (6 or 8 October), the administration, after a three-month interruption, organised my studies. Three Chinese comrades brought me dozens of books. . . . On 3 October I stated that in line with the decision of the Chinese government to send all Soviet students and trainees out of China, I would leave on 6 October, i.e., two months before the completion of my visit. When on 5 October I went to the University to get my documents back, the administration began to play an incomprehensible and dishonest game. All of a sudden they began to persuade me to stay. This conversation lasted for three hours. Twice I phoned the embassy asking them to send a car for me, but the Chinese told the people who came for me that I was no longer at the University. When I found out about this, I decided to get to the embassy on my own. . . .

Question: Why do you think classical literature has been prohibited in modern China?

Answer: This literature contains a number of sharp critical judgments made against the magnates and emperors. The present leaders obviously are afraid that the younger generation will be infected with this critical attitude. . . .

Viktor Usov is a sixth-year student in the Chinese department of the Institute of Eastern Languages at the Moscow State University. In China he was studying at the Peking Language Institute. We asked him to tell us about the conditions for Soviet students at the Peking Language Institute.

'The Institute administration', he said, 'understood our tasks in a very singular manner. It was felt that we had come to the Institute not to study Chinese language and literature, but to bone up on the works of Mao Tse-tung. At our language exercises, for example, we were always given the works of Mao Tse-tung. Even in the studies of Chinese literature, we were never given a part of a novel or a story

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which did not contain some statement by Mao. In our written exams on the langauge in July, of the twenty questions we were given, half were related to the works of Mao Tse-tung. When the Korean students refused to answer these questions, saying, " We come here to study not the works of Mao Tse-tung but the Chinese language ", they were given lower grades. Later on, instead of studying the history of the Chinese Revolution as should have happened under the plan, they began to stuff us with materials on the " Chinese cultural revolution ", on the pretext that the students themselves had asked for this. In fact, no one had asked the Institute administration about this. . . .

' At the Institute there was an atmosphere of secretiveness and mistrust of the Soviet students . . . They encountered constant difficulties on the part of the Chinese administration. For example, we were not able to get into any of the libraries in Peking. When we insisted on this, they asked us for a list of the literature we wanted to see, and the Chinese teacher could cross off the list anything he did not like. . . . Access to the Peking Public Library was prohibited for the Soviet students.' . . .

In conclusion, V. Usov gave his impressions of the ' cultural revolution ' in China.

' Once ', he said, ' we looked on as thousands of students filled the auditorium of the nearby Institute of Foreign Languages. The walls of the Institute and the gates were plastered with the posters, wall newspapers, which contained appeals to " destroy the black band which has infiltrated the Peking Municipal Party Committee, protect Chairman Mao Tse-tung, and advance the cultural revolution ". Many of the posters contained anti-Soviet attacks. . . .

' Early in July, the usually lively square round the classroom building of the Institute was all of a sudden empty. We were told that the students and teachers of the Institute were busy carrying out a " cultural revolution ". In August, the " cultural revolution " was in full swing. . . . It even reached the walls of our Institute. To our amazement, listed among the " reactionaries " on the posters was the secretary of the party committee and one of the directors of our Institute. Their heads were shaved and they were forced to wear black bands. They were put in a detachment made up of the teachers and leaders of the party committee of the Institute of Foreign Languages who had also been placed in the " harmful elements " category. From morning to night we saw the wild Red Guards forcing their leaders and teachers to push heavy wheelbarrows with earth, to cut the grass on the football field, or dig up roots at the old cemetery. Among them were five or six women . . . The Red Guards said this was the best method of re-education.

' From the windows of the dormitory we could frequently see the Red Guards, while beating drums and gongs, deal out justice to their next victim, a supposed " black element ". The " guilty person " was put in the middle of a circle, and they hung on him blackboards with

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a list of all his " crimes ", and then the court began. At times it went as far as physical punishment. Who were these people? We were never told what they were guilty of or what was their further fate.

' At the end of August we were able to leave our Institute to go to the city. It was almost impossible to travel through Peking. Hundreds of thousands of Red Guards who had come into the city filled the streets and squares of the capital. Piles of antique furniture, stucco mouldings representing lions and dragons, and richly decorated gravestones lay about the streets—this was Peking at the height of the " cultural revolution ". In the bookstores only the works of Mao Tse-tung could be bought. The famous Chinese porcelain and the traditional artisan crafts had disappeared from the shelves. Lipstick, perfume, high-heeled shoes—all this was considered the paraphernalia of bourgeois culture. From the windows of our bus we saw two people who had been beaten to death. One was being hauled along in a garbage truck, the other in a wheelbarrow. His body had been mauled beyond recognition and smeared with black paint. . . .

' Not long before we left, the Chinese authorities decided to show us the " cultural revolution " in action. We were all brought together and taken to a poster exhibit at Peking University. . . . On the wall we saw an enormous poster with a portrait done in black paint of the famous Chinese historian and pro-rector of the University, Professor Chiang Po-tsan. His face had been crossed out in white paint. He is seventy and ailing; he is an old communist whose name is known far beyond the frontiers of China; he had been hauled out onto the street by the Red Guards, who struck him and spat at him. They put a bucket on the head of the professor's wife, who had tried to defend him, and struck her '. . .

The actions of the Red Guards on the streets of Peking had an openly anti-Soviet character. ' We were particularly indignant ', Viktor Usov said, ' because of the outrages organised by the Chinese authorities in front of the Soviet embassy. During the siege of the Soviet embassy in August by crowds of Red Guards which lasted several days, there were occasions when the wives of workers of our embassy phoned us and asked us to bring milk for the children, since it was impossible to leave the embassy. . . . We were fed up with this " cultural revolution ", which has nothing in common with either culture or a revolution, and we were fed up with the indoctrination with Maoism which we were subjected to at the Institute. At the beginning of October we returned to our motherland. The classrooms in which we studied at the Peking Language Institute are now filled with Red Guards.'

Chinese Students back from the USSR

The following extracts from speeches by Chinese students who had returned from the USSR, given at a rally in Peking on 5 *November* 1966, *were published in* Peking Review, 25 *November* 1966, *under the*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heading: 'Soviet Revisionist Renegades' Obstruction and Persecution against Chinese Students.'

Speech by Hung Kang

The Soviet Government's brutal action in recently expelling all the Chinese students was a long-premeditated plot. The Soviet revisionist leading group have long ago done everything they could to cook up all kinds of pretexts to drastically cut down the number of Chinese students studying in the Soviet Union. They did everything they could to make difficulties for the small number of Chinese students they had accepted. We students encountered all manner of restrictions and persecution politically as well as in our studies and day-to-day life.

We were sent to study in the Soviet Union according to the cultural agreement between China and the Soviet Union, but the treatment we received there makes one most angry. The Soviet revisionist leading group have always sabotaged the cultural agreement between the two countries. They either intentionally postponed arrangements for the studies of the Chinese students for a long period or violated the agreement by altering their specialities without any consultation. They have never ensured or provided adequate conditions for the studies of the Chinese students. They have always made up excuses to arbitrarily shorten their period of study and have even compelled Chinese students to suspend their studies midway and return home . . .

Most of the Chinese students who went to study in the Soviet Union last year were allocated by the Soviet side to cities and schools with very poor conditions for study. The schools lacked facilities for study; moreover most of them had never had foreign post-graduate students before, and the teaching staff were poor, lacking in experience. The Soviet side did not provide the Chinese students with the necessary conditions for study; what is more, they did their best to create difficulties in their study. They were so fearful of the Chinese students propagating Mao Tse-tung's thought in Moscow, the centre of revisionism, that they purposely allocated 25 of them taking advanced study in practical Russian to Irkutsk in far-off Siberia. In Irkutsk, these students had none of the facilities for studying the language; even the minimum necessity—a classroom—was not guaranteed.

We Chinese students, taught by the Party and Chairman Mao, always love labour, are diligent and live frugally, never worrying about living conditions or personal advantages. However, we cannot but be indignant over the discrimination and persecution to which we students were subjected to (*sic*) by the Soviet revisionist leading authorities in our living arrangements. Last year, one of the Chinese students who had just arrived in the Soviet Union was assigned to live in a much dilapidated hut for three people. Later, when it was learnt that someone from the Chinese Embassy was going to see him, he was hurriedly moved to a hotel. . . .

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The new Soviet revisionist leadership have always regarded the Chinese students as a thorn in their side and have consistently pursued a savage and fascist-like persecution of the Chinese students. They have constantly had agents watching our actions, secretly listening to or making tape-recordings of our conversations and secretly examining our books and study material. They forbade the Chinese students to receive guests, forbade the Soviet people and even the Chinese residents in the Soviet Union from having contact with the Chinese students. They sent thugs to prevent Chinese students from listening to Radio Peking and unjustifiably prevented them from receiving copies of *Renmin Ribao* to which they had subscribed. Some students who had subscribed for a year's *Renmin Ribao*, received altogether not more than a month's copies of the paper.

Incidents constantly occurred in which the Soviet authorities used violence against Chinese students and went so far as to endanger their lives. On 4 March last year, Chinese students' blood was spilled on the streets of Moscow when they took part in the foreign students' demonstration to support Vietnam and oppose US imperialism and they were harshly suppressed by the Soviet authorities. The Soviet authorities also sent agents to throw mercury, cigarette butts and match boxes into the Chinese students' cooking pots and even got thugs to beat up Chinese students in the middle of the night when they were asleep. Although we demanded again and again that the Soviet authorities protect our safety, the persecution against us, far from being reduced, became more flagrant. On 10 October this year, an anti-China lecture was given at Leningrad University. When three Chinese students asked to speak in rebuttal, a group of agents and thugs rushed on to the rostrum, and beat the Chinese students up separately.

On 1 October, to celebrate the 17th anniversary of the founding of our great motherland, the People's Republic of China, Chinese students wanted to tell the Soviet teachers and students of the great achievements of China's socialist revolution and construction, and, as was the custom, applied to all leaderships in places where there were Chinese students for permission to put on small pictorial exhibitions for the purpose. But, with a few exceptions, the students' reasonable requests were turned down by the great majority of the Soviet authorities in these places because they were afraid of the truth, afraid of Mao Tse-tung's thought, and afraid that the Soviet masses would become informed of China's real situation. When the Chinese students asked why they were denied the right to hold an exhibition while the United States was allowed to do so in Moscow, the Soviet side's answer was: 'Because the United States does not oppose us.' This indeed was a confession of Soviet revisionism's alignment with the United States to oppose China. . . .

Still more outrageous is the fact that the Soviet Government, after unilaterally tearing up the agreement on cultural cooperation between the two countries and ordering the Chinese students to suspend their

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

studies, went so far as to instruct Soviet Communist Party members to openly incite defection among the Chinese students. In Irkutsk, the Soviet authorities sent a Soviet Communist Party member to get hold of Chinese students singly for 'talks' on a number of occasions in vain attempts to delude them into betraying their motherland. He had the impudence to make the contemptible suggestion: 'If you want political asylum, all you have to do is to sign a paper.' When the Chinese students angrily asked him who sent him, this person confessed: 'It's not my own idea; it was decided in consultation.' We immediately raised the strongest protest with the Soviet side. Confronted with the facts, their rector had to admit the guilt.

When the Soviet revisionists were unable to preserve their 'smiling' masks any longer, they revealed their ferocious fascist-type thug features. The revisionist authorities of Tashkent attempted to conceal from the Chinese students the Soviet Government's decision to unjustifiably order the Chinese students to return home while attempting to secretly detain a Chinese student, Mumin. However, when Mumin received the Chinese Embassy's note telling him to leave Tashkent and to go to Moscow, the Soviet side brazenly sent policemen and thugs to seize Mumin's luggage and injured his arm. Failing to attain their object by force, they tried to prevent Mumin from catching his train on the pretext that his luggage was over-weight. However, because of the valiant struggle of Mumin and the help of revolutionary African classmates, the revisionists' plot failed.

The revolutionary spirit and the good ideological style of the Chinese students won high praise and left a deep impression on the ordinary people of the Soviet Union. Many Soviet students and people said to us: 'It is Comrade Mao Tse-tung who has brought you up so well.' One teacher said: 'I have been teaching for more than ten years, but never have I taught students as good as you. I would be very pleased to go on studying with you and teaching you, but there's nothing I can do about it.'

Quite a number of Soviet people have seen through the nature of the new leaders of the CPSU and have clearly seen that they are out-and-out Khrushchev revisionists who have gone further than Khrushchev. We are deeply impressed by the fact that the Soviet people are always on our side. They have shown immense indignation at the Soviet revisionist leading group's acts, which are intended to undermine Sino-Soviet relations and the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples, and at the various crimes they have committed against the Chinese students studying in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet revisionist leading group is extremely fearful of revolution, of the people, and the spreading of Mao Tse-tung's thought in the Soviet Union. They think that by driving the Chinese students out of the Soviet Union they would be able to rest in peace. But things always develop counter to the wishes of the revisionists. . . .

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Speech by Chang Peng-ya

In the Soviet Union today, the dictatorship of the proletariat has been replaced by the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The high-salaried privileged stratum of society which the Soviet revisionist leading clique represents forms a new exploiting class which oppresses and exploits the Soviet working masses in all sorts of ways and subjects them to the rule of fascist terror.

A Soviet driller was fired and suffered vicious political persecution solely because he showed some discontent with the reactionary actions of the Soviet leading clique. The so-called Soviet security department had him labelled 'mad' and sent him to a 'psychiatric hospital'. This clique, afraid of the masses and the truth, fiercely suppresses the Soviet people. Under a variety of pretexts, it imprisons large numbers of honest people in 'psychiatric hospitals' and 'insane asylums' where they are subjected to outrageous mental torture. Such cases are now quite common in all parts of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet revisionist leading clique has destroyed the very foundation of proletarian democracy in order to maintain its reactionary rule. The working masses of the Soviet Union have been deprived of all freedom of speech, assembly and election.

New Capitalists and Landlords Emerging

The high-salaried privileged stratum exploits the toiling masses at will and squanders the products of their blood and sweat by using its privileged position to engage in embezzlement, speculation, rigging the market and graft. The members of this stratum live extravagantly and dissolutely, in glaring contrast with the growing impoverishment of the masses of the working people.

Not far from the capital of one of the union republics where we lived there are some lovely hills, and, nestling among them, a fair sprinkling of villas—resorts of some of the big Soviet bureaucrats and the rich. They enjoy themselves and live a princely life there. The ordinary Soviet people call the place 'little America'. The Party secretary in one locality, with just a few members in his family, occupies two magnificent buildings with a total floor space of more than 1,300 square metres. Yet a large number of workers there are living in very bad housing conditions and some are virtually homeless.

One leading Soviet revisionist has a luxurious mansion on the outskirts of Moscow and a private villa on the Black Sea coast. The villa has two swimming pools, one for fresh water, and another for sea water, which is drawn in by a special pump. At a university an old worker told us with great bitterness: 'To think that I have lived to see the emergence of new capitalists and landlords in our country!'

Corruption, bribery and speculation are rife and incredibly widespread. Large numbers of urban and rural speculators, countenanced and even abetted by members of the leading clique of Soviet revisionists,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speculate in almost everything from fruit and vegetables to grain and automobiles, operate black markets or set up underground factories. . . . In many cities there are local influential people who cruelly exploit the working people, not sparing even the lowest paid sweepers whose monthly incomes are just a few score rubles. Bribery is blatantly practised even by the police bureaux and the courts in many cities. . . .

In the Soviet countryside today, with the collective economy being undermined, capitalism is rampant. The polarisation process is intensifying and new kulaks are rapidly emerging. There is a so-called 'collective farmer' who employs men to look after his large private flock of as many as 15,000 sheep. Another 'collective farmer' and members of his family draw around 800 rubles a year from the collective farm. But his income alone from the grapes he grows in his private orchard amounts to over 4,000 rubles annually. In addition, he has many horses, cows and sheep. Such instances are too numerous to count. . . .

The Soviet press openly conducts propaganda about the outlook on life of the bourgeoisie which in effect says that 'God curses those who do not pursue selfish interests'. It makes great efforts to advertise films which reflect the philosophy of survival and extreme individualism, such as *Nobody Is Willing to Die*, and *When You Are Still Alive*. At a meeting in one city to celebrate the 47th anniversary of the founding of the Komsomol, a local leader publicly wished the youths present good luck in finding a beautiful lover while at school and getting a 'good' job after graduation.

The Soviet revisionist leading clique uses the press, radio and television to spread the most degenerate bourgeois trash to befuddle people and poison the minds of the young. The Soviet authorities openly laud jazz as 'very pleasant to the ear', and rock-and-roll as 'art' and 'good for the health'. Young people are specifically taught rock-and-roll. A leader at a university publicly told the students: 'Why do you bother about political questions? Go and dance, go to evening parties, make love!' During the 23rd congress of the CPSU, some institutes of higher learning held lewd dancing parties where revolting pictures of naked women served as decorations. . . .

The Soviet revisionist leading clique has given the green light to decadent fiction and to photographs of nude women, all of which come from the West; and it publishes 'fashion' and 'hair-style' magazines, to corrupt the Soviet people, particularly the youth.

'A Graded System of Promotion' in Schools

In order to maintain and consolidate its revisionist rule, the Soviet revisionist leading clique makes the educational front its main sphere for getting a grip on the young people; it spares no effort in selecting and training its 'successors'. Its line for education is a revisionist one, which serves its revisionist political line in many respects—in the system of enrolment, the content of education, the examination system and the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allocation of posts after graduation. There is discrimination against students from worker or peasant families. Education is divorced from reality, from labour, and scholasticism is indulged in. The schools place 'money in command' and 'marks above everything'. The amount of a student's subsidy is determined by his or her marks. There is 'a graded system of promotion': post-graduates, candidate doctors and doctors. The higher the degree, the higher the salary. This is done deliberately to encourage teachers and students to seek personal fame and monetary rewards.

As a result of the wide dissemination of reactionary bourgeois ideas among the people, and particularly the youth, the atmosphere in Soviet society is one of deterioration. Prostitutes ply the streets of some cities even in the day time. Drunkenness, immoral conduct, violence and murder are common. Women dare not go out in the street after dark in many places. Juvenile delinquency is on the increase Youngsters being sentenced to punishment is an everyday occurrence in the courts. . . .

Underground Current of Resistance is Rising

The counter-revolutionary revisionist line pursued by the Soviet leading clique has become increasingly unpopular among the people. Last August, a Soviet journalist said: 'The group that is now in the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party has nothing in common with the Party of Lenin. The members of the new leadership of the Soviet Communist Party are all of the Khrushchev type.'

A taxi driver said angrily: 'The leaders here have bled the people white!' A middle-aged woman told one of our Chinese students: 'We all call them "red" capitalists—those people in the Soviet Communist Party leadership who draw fat salaries. They don't want communism or revolution. They're afraid of revolution. And they're afraid of China's great cultural revolution.' A worker said: 'Khrushchev was like a bad tooth that was pulled without pulling out the root. That makes it all the more painful!'

Broad sections of the Soviet revolutionary people see more and more clearly through the sham 'building of communism' by which the Soviet revisionist leading clique tries to deceive the people. . . .

There are many signs that the strong dissatisfaction felt by the Soviet people against the leading revisionist clique is steadily growing to the point of struggles against it. Taxi drivers in one city twice went on strike last spring. Five university students were recently arrested for distributing leaflets and organising other activities against the leading Soviet revisionist clique. Not long ago, news began circulating widely in the Soviet Union about the activities of an underground group of 25, including workers, intellectuals, and engineers. Their slogan of action is 'from bureaucratic dictatorship to the dictatorship of the proletariat'. They are determined to overthrow the bureaucrat-capitalist class and restore the dictatorship of the proletariat.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The great Soviet people will surely carry out revolution. They see light and hope in China's persevering on the socialist road and in Chairman Mao, the greatest leader of the revolutionary people the world over. As one Soviet friend put it to us: 'Our hopes are now on the Chinese Communist Party headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. Our hopes are on China.' Many Soviet people told us with great confidence: 'Sooner or later we will make a revolution right here.' We are convinced that one day the great Soviet people with their revolutionary tradition will rise up in rebellion against the Soviet revisionist leading clique. The proletarian revolution, which the leadership of the CPSU has strangled, will shine again in all its glory in the home of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and the banner of Marxism-Leninism which it has torn down will once again fly high over the land of the Soviets.

Speech by Hu Teh-pao

While in the Soviet Union we had the deep feeling that the Soviet people had a boundless love for Chairman Mao and the greatest esteem for him. They would express this in a thousand and one ways. One Soviet worker told us Chinese students: 'I love Mao Tse-tung very much. I've had a portrait of Mao Tse-tung in my house, and I am very happy to sleep under it. Living in the era of Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese people enjoy the greatest happiness.' 'Mao Tse-tung', he added with great emotion, 'is not just the great leader of the Chinese people but the great leader of the Soviet people as well.' Another worker put it forthrightly: 'We workers have great respect for Mao Tse-tung because he speaks for us, the working class.' . . .

Another person, praising China's great proletarian cultural revolution, noted: 'Lenin led the Great October Revolution and his name was known throughout the world. Today Mao Tse-tung is leading China's great cultural revolution and his name too is known all over the world. China's great cultural revolution too will make its influence felt among us.'

In Leningrad, a middle-aged man, when coming across some Chinese, looked around sharply and said: 'Please convey to Comrade Mao Tse-tung for me the best regards of the whole Soviet people! He is the greatest Marxist-Leninist. He is really defending the Soviet Union.' . . .

Sometimes, the Soviet people, at the risk of being shadowed by the police and special agents, came to us to show their deep love for Chairman Mao. One day this year, as several of us Chinese students were sitting on a park bench chatting, a man suddenly came up from behind and whispered: 'You have Mao Tse-tung, a true Lenin.' No sooner had he finished this than he walked away along a side path.

Then there was the news about Chairman Mao swimming in the Yangtse and people said to us: 'Comrade Mao Tse-tung is in excellent health, this is a blessing not only to you but to the revolutionary people all over the world.' Many of them heartily cheered: 'May Mao Tse-tung live a long life!'

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviet people often listen to Radio Peking. They also try to find Chairman Mao's works and study them. Because the bookstores in the Soviet Union do not sell Chairman Mao's works, a young worker had to seek help from many people and it took him more than two years to find and buy the first three volumes of the Russian edition of *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung* from a private source; later he also got hold of a Volume IV published in China. A student at a technical institute who is very fond of reading Chairman Mao's works has already gone through the first two volumes of the *Selected Works*, Russian edition, and most of the articles in the third volume. He has been studying Chairman Mao's works quite seriously, taking many notes as he read them. . . .

In the Soviet Union, even though Chairman Mao's works have been banned, there are many people who make every effort to read them. They have drawn inexhaustible strength from them and have found the way to advance.

The Red Square Incident: Foreign Ministry Press Conference (extract)

Tass Report, 28 January 1967

The Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs has described as 'unprecedented in Soviet-Chinese relations' the actions of citizens of the People's Republic of China in the Red Square on 25 January. Several witnesses of this incident took part in a press conference given by Boris Pyadyshev, Deputy Head of the Press Department of the Foreign Ministry. He declared that the incident in Red Square on 25 January was 'nothing but an undisguised provocation, planned in advance'. 'All the actions of the Chinese students were directed by the First Secretary at the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in Moscow, who tried to foment disorder.'

On that day some 70 Chinese, who were in Moscow on their way home, tried to prevent Soviet people who had come to the Red Square from visiting the Lenin Mausoleum. Lining up in front of the entrance they chanted quotations from Mao Tse-tung, while 700–800 people waited patiently in a temperature of minus 18 degrees Centigrade. When a militiaman asked them to clear the entrance to the Mausoleum and stop delaying the queue, the Chinese started shouting hysterically, and one of them struck in the face a woman standing in the queue. This served as a signal for the whole group. The Chinese started assaulting Soviet people. They left the Red Square only when Soviet people from the queue clasped hands and, forming a line, forced them away from the Mausoleum.

Boris Pyadyshev said that the aim of this outrage was to damage Soviet-Chinese relations and the friendship between the peoples of the USSR and China. . . .

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Chargé d'Affaires of the People's Republic of China, An Chih-yuan, refused for several hours to respond to the summons of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 25 January. During this time Chinese embassy staff and employees of the NCNA were telephoning correspondents from western countries and the embassies of capitalist countries, spreading false stories about the incident in the Red Square. The master-minds behind the outrage in the Red Square arranged a meeting at the Chinese embassy which was addressed by the Chargé d'Affaires. He expressed his 'admiration' of the actions of the hooligans. The Chargé d'Affaires threatened that the Soviet people 'would pay for our blood'. Boris Pyadyshev said: 'This instigation by an official representative of the People's Republic of China is unprecedented in world diplomatic practice and beyond the limits of tolerance.'

The Chinese representatives staged a 'real masquerade' during the departure of the group of students from the Yaroslavsky railway station. The students appeared on the platform with bandages and plaster on their cheeks while their faces were stained with iodine. A documentary film about this 'show' was projected at the press conference. . . . After the events of 25 January a member of the embassy staff, who took part in the incident in the Red Square, was summoned to the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. During his visit to the Ministry he had no traces of bruises or swellings, but on the next day when he appeared at the Yaroslavsky railway station his whole face was smeared with iodine. On their way many students, apparently, got fed up with the bandages and plaster. In Perm only five out of 20 men were seen wearing these indications of the masquerade.

Boris Pyadyshev said that the provocative escapades in Moscow had been followed by a new wave of outrages outside the building of the Soviet embassy in Peking which 'is practically deprived of the possibility of functioning normally'. . .

Pyadyshev said that the contention of the Chinese that there were some 300 militiamen in the Red Square was 'fantastic'. He said that at the time there were, as usual, two or three militiamen near the Mausoleum. In the whole of the Red Square there were not more than ten of them.

Khrushchev's disciples will definitely come to no good end

Liberation Army Daily, 29 January 1967

The Soviet counter-revolutionary revisionist ruling clique, in a violent fit of hysteria, frenziedly repressed the Chinese students who visited Lenin's mausoleum and Stalin's tomb to pay their homage. The blood of Chinese revolutionary youth was thus once again shed on the streets of Moscow.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Burning with irrepressible wrath, the Chinese people and the Chinese people's Liberation Army voice their most vehement protest against this fascist outrage by the Soviet revisionist filthy swine. We hereby serve a stern warning to the Soviet revisionist chieftains Brezhnev, Kosygin and their like: you disciples of Khrushchev will definitely come to no good end for betraying the revolution, betraying the people, and savagely suppressing the students' movement.

By laying wreaths at Lenin's mausoleum and Stalin's tomb and reading out quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung before the mausoleum pointing out that the capitalist system will eventually be replaced by the socialist system, the Chinese students expressed the boundless respect of the Chinese people, led by their great leader Chairman Mao, for V. I. Lenin, great teacher of proletarian revolution, and J. V. Stalin, great Marxist-Leninist, as well as the Chinese people's incomparably sincere revolutionary friendship for the great Soviet people. This revolutionary action was excellent. It was enthusiastically praised and applauded by the Soviet people and all revolutionary people of the world. The handful of revisionist elements alone trembled with fear in the face of this revolutionary action and, acting as if confronted by formidable enemies, used ruthless violence against the Chinese students. This has proved to the hilt that they are jackals of the same lair as the Tsar, Hitler, and Lyndon Johnson, being reactionary elements and the sworn enemies of the revolutionary people of the whole world.

Why is the Soviet revisionist leading clique so hostile to the Chinese people? Why did it want to create such shocking bloody incidents in the high tide of China's great proletarian cultural revolution?

The Chinese people are a great, thoroughly revolutionary people armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought. They are staunch, fearless, heroic fighters against imperialism and modern revisionism. In the great proletarian cultural revolution in China, hundreds of millions of revolutionary people, rallying under the great red banner of the proletarian revolutionary line represented by Chairman Mao, have launched a general offensive against the handful of party members in authority who are taking the capitalist road, and against those die-hards persisting in the bourgeois reactionary line, and have dragged out the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionist elements. China's great proletarian cultural revolution, which is digging up the roots of revisionism and capitalism, is striking terror into the very hearts of the satans in the Kremlin and making them tremble with fear. They are scared of the great thought of Mao Tse-tung and afraid that the Chinese people's revolutionary rebellious spirit will hasten the awakening of the Soviet people and make them rebel and wrest power from these revisionist leaders. It was precisely for this reason that they were in such a hurry to come out themselves to whip up a new anti-China campaign in rabid opposition to the Chinese people and to China's great proletarian cultural revolution.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Extracts from an article by Wang Li, Chia Yi-hsueh, and Li Hsin

Peking Review, 23 December 1966

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has pointed out that socialist society is still built on the basis of class antagonism and that throughout the extremely long historical period of socialism there is struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads. The struggle between the two classes and between the two roads is the principal contradiction in socialist society and the motive force for its advance.

Since the struggle between the two classes and between the two roads exists in socialist society, if we are not vigilant and fail to adopt the necessary measures, the danger of the dictatorship of the proletariat degenerating into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie exists and the danger of the restoration of capitalism exists.

The Soviet revisionist leading clique deliberately ignores the fact that contradictions exist in socialist society, and categorically denies the existence of classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union. Khrushchev does and so do his disciples Brezhnev, Kosygin and Shelepin.

Such nonsense as their 'socialist-society-without-contradictions' is aimed at protecting the interests of the revisionist leading clique and the privileged strata of the Soviet Union, and at maintaining their reactionary rule over the Soviet people. Their denial of the existence of classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union is precisely a weapon that they wield in the class struggle. As a matter of fact, they plant themselves firmly on the side of the bourgeoisie, suppressing the proletariat and carrying on ruthless class struggle against the Soviet people. They use the allegation that there are neither classes nor class struggle as grounds for 'the state of the whole people' and 'the Party of the entire people', in order to deceive the Soviet people and the people of the world and cover up their traitorous deeds in abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. They have completely betrayed the great Lenin and Stalin. What they fear most is for the Soviet people to rise in rebellion against revisionism and capitalist restoration, engage in class struggle against them, overthrow their rule and re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . .

Revolutionary people throughout the world unanimously praise China's great proletarian cultural revolution, while Brezhnev, Kosygin, Shelepin and other renegades like them, in collusion with imperialists like Johnson and Rusk, grind their teeth and heap curses on it. Turning on all their propaganda machinery and using the most vicious language, they have stirred up an anti-China hysteria to wildly attack China's great

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cultural revolution. Why are the reactionaries so incensed? Precisely because China's great proletarian cultural revolution, like a prairie fire, will inevitably spread among the people of the world, exercise a tremendous influence on the revolutionary struggle of the people of all countries, and pound against and shake the tottering rule of imperialism and modern revisionism. China's great proletarian cultural revolution, unparalleled in history, has sounded the death knell of imperialism and modern revisionism even more loudly.

The new chieftains of the Soviet revisionist group have now all come out into the open and thus torn off the mask with which they once tried to deceive people. Thus they have revealed themselves more openly as being of the same stripe as Khrushchev, and even worse than him. And this will inevitably rouse the Soviet people still further to oppose them. They are themselves speeding up their march towards the same end as Khrushchev.

In the history of the development of Marxism, whether at the time of its birth or when it achieved historic victory and developed to a new stage, the ghosts and monsters of the whole world had collaborated in launching fierce counter-attacks against it.

When Marxism first appeared in Europe and was beginning to be mastered by the working class, its enemies immediately sensed a great threat. At that time, all the reactionary forces in Europe joined in a 'Holy Alliance' against Marxism, vainly attempting to exorcise this 'spectre' that had appeared in Europe. When Marxism developed to the stage of Leninism and achieved an epoch-making victory in the October Revolution, all the imperialists who were then strangling each other, the revisionist 'heroes' of the Second International who served the imperialists, and the scabs and traitors of all countries, again joined forces in a 'Holy Alliance' against Leninism and conducted ferocious encirclement attacks against it. Now, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism with genius and creativeness and in an all-round way, and thus raised it to a completely new stage. The imperialists headed by the United States, the modern revisionists with the C.P.S.U. leadership at their centre, all reactionaries and all old and new scabs and turncoats in the world, have once again joined forces in knocking together a 'Holy Alliance' against Mao Tse-tung's thought. They vainly attempt to resist the spread of Mao Tse-tung's thought to the whole world and obstruct the grasping of Mao Tse-tung's thought—an invincible ideological weapon—by the oppressed people and nations.

One after another, those past 'heroes' who opposed Marxism and Leninism were thrown into the garbage heap of history. Today's 'heroes' who oppose Mao Tse-tung's thought will meet a still sadder defeat. Their clamouring is no more than a frantic last-ditch struggle.

Actively responding to Comrade Lin Piao's call, the Chinese people, in the great proletarian cultural revolution, are carrying forward to a new stage the mass movement for the creative study and application of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chairman Mao's works. The arming of the Chinese people with Mao Tse-tung's thought is the most reliable and fundamental guarantee for the prevention of revisionism and a capitalist restoration and for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Working Class and the 'Cultural Revolution' in China (extracts)

F. Vladimirov

Trud, 6 January 1967

Chinese propaganda is trying to impress on public opinion that the so-called 'cultural revolution' is being carried on in the interests of the proletariat and multi-million-strong peasantry. A version is being widely spread to the effect that the 'cultural revolution' is designed to stimulate production, to rout those who are going along the capitalist road, to critcise the ideology of the bourgeoisie and all the exploiting classes, to reform education, literature and art, etc. It seems that great and noble tasks have been set and that the working masses, above all, should be interested in their implementation. But what is the actual state of affairs?

Judging by the reports of the Chinese press the working class does not support the forms and methods of the 'cultural revolution' launched on instructions from above. More than that, the working class is resisting the 'revolution'. The Chinese press reported that 'Red Guards' were thrown out of many enterprises in Peking, Shanghai, Tientsin, Wuhan, Kwangchow, Changsha, Chungking, Nanchang, Harbin and other places . . .

Groups of the 'cultural revolution', committees of the 'cultural revolution' and other agencies were set up in the course of the campaign at schools, colleges, offices. Workers and peasants are not represented on these bodies. Nevertheless, the eleventh plenary meeting of the CPC Central Committee declared that 'the groups of the cultural revolution, committees of the cultural revolution, and conferences of the cultural revolution are the best link between our Party and the masses'. The organisations set up behind the back of the working class are opposed to the already existing political institutions, while the solution of all problems was brought within the competence of the 'cultural revolution' committees.

What was the purpose of Mao Tse-tung and his group in setting up new political organisations and removing old ones? This did not happen by chance. The reason is that the course pursued by Mao Tse-tung and his associates as regards the vital interests of the working people failed and lost popular support.

At the time of the 'big leap' Mao Tse-tung, in order to step up the enthusiasm of the masses, put forward the slogan 'Three Years of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Persistent Work Mean Ten Thousand Years of Happiness'. The people believed Mao and worked for many years without demanding any special remuneration for their work. But the eternal happiness did not come. On the contrary, living standards went down considerably as a result of the voluntaristic actions of Mao Tse-tung and his associates that led to economic failures. Wages are at the 1956 level, 50–60 yuans a month on the average . . . while the prices of commodities are as follows: a kilogram of meat costs two yuans, a kilogram of vegetable oil two yuans, flour 0.5 yuan, a pair of shoes from 15 to 30 yuans, clocks and watches from 60 to 120 yuans. It costs from 59 to 60 yuans a month to feed a family of three in Peking . . .

In this connection a propaganda campaign has been launched in China calling on the population to eat less, reduce expenditure on food to eight yuans per person per month, not to invite guests, not to make presents, to economise in everything. Every striving to improve life is regarded as 'bourgeois degeneration', as an attempt to 'restore capitalism'. 'We advance to the forefront revolutionisation of enterprises, revolutionisation of people', wrote the leading organ of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, *Kungjen Jih pao.*

In one of the plays running at all the country's theatres, a young soldier, addressing the audience, says: 'Before, you walked barefoot, then in canvas shoes. Now you wear rubber shoes. Later, you'll want to sport leather shoes, and perhaps even high boots. There's no knowing how far you can go in bourgeois degeneration!'

Mao and his group use the principle of material incentives only in one case—to stimulate the study of 'Mao Tse-tung's ideas'. It is one of the duties of every worker to study 'Mao Tse-tung's ideas', and 'be a good disciple of Mao Tse-tung'. Only when these obligations are fulfilled can a worker expect a bonus . . .

A further reduction of the present minimum living standards is clearly seen in Mao Tse-tung's new idea: workers must go over to the self-sufficiency system. Widely popularised in China is the example of the Taching oil workers who, according to the Chinese newspapers, 'having built modern oil wells and factories themselves live in simple huts . . . and fend for themselves'. The essence of this policy consists in workers building such enterprises with minimum government outlays, producing industrial commodities, and supplying themselves with food, as well as housing . . . This policy, advanced four years ago, is being widely publicised in China and still is not meeting with support among the working class.

In order to put this policy and others like it into effect, Mao Tse-tung and his close associates advanced the slogan of organising the life of society on army lines, i.e. creating an organisation which would obey any demand, any order. In this connection, the Red Guard newspaper, *Hungweiping Pao*, wrote on 17 November: 'In May of this year Mao Tse-tung made a great appeal to the entire people to turn all the country's establishments, service sectors, and party and administrative

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bodies into high revolutionary schools on the lines of the People's Liberation Army of China.'

In practice this means that all working collectives, all organisations, should become detachments where army order and rigid army discipline will prevail.

Although the 'cultural revolution' formally declared that its main task was to destroy those who 'tried to follow the path of capitalism', it has not affected the bourgeoisie at all. The latter continue to live in China at the expense of exploitation of the working class. They are taking it easy. In the eighteenth year of popular power in China, that country has about 1,200,000 capitalists, who till this day continue to receive from the state substantial amounts of money as payment for the capital taken away from them.

In keeping with the decision of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, the payment of interest to the bourgeoisie should have been completed in 1962. Then it was prolonged to 1966, and it has now been learned that the Chinese bourgeoisie will continue to receive their interest for another ten years, even though they were fully repaid back in 1962.

Many representatives of the national bourgeoisie are members of elected executive bodies. For instance, Liu Nieh-yi, a Shanghai capitalist, is working as a director at his 'former' factory and receiving a monthly salary of 250 yuans. He has his own twin-storeyed house and his own car. For his capital he gets a yearly interest of 450,000 yuans. This capitalist has declared that in Shanghai industrial enterprises, the management is not in the hands of the workers and the Communist Party, but in the hands of former capitalists.

Nevertheless, the champions of the 'cultural revolution' have not only left the bourgeoisie alone, but have hastened to assure them that their interests will continue to be observed in the future as well.

That is what the 'proletarian cultural revolution' in China is like.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ARMY

Events in China and the People's Liberation Army (extracts)

Krasnaya Zvezda, 29 December 1966

The Soviet press has been publishing materials describing what is happening in China under the guise of the socalled 'cultural revolution'. Men of the armed forces of the USSR, like all Soviet people, are concerned and anxious over the line pursued by the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which is openly directed against the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, against the international unity of the communist movement and the political course it has charted.

Decisions taken at the eleventh plenary meeting of the CPC Central Committee show that Mao Tse-tung and his entourage have elevated their anti-Soviet line into the rank of official policy and declared the CPSU and the Soviet Union their Enemy Number One, against which they intend to 'wage a struggle to the end' and whose 'defeat' they regard as a prerequisite for the struggle against imperialism. The systematic indoctrination of the Chinese people in an anti-Soviet spirit is now being conducted on an unprecedented scale. Moreover, the CPC leaders are trying to extend their anti-Soviet activity to the territory of the USSR. Dozens of Chinese radio stations are transmitting hostile slanderous propaganda against the Soviet Union . . .

In view of what is happening in China, Soviet servicemen are naturally interested in the role and place of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) in these events and the line which the CPC leadership pursues with regard to the PLA . . .

To reinforce their positions in the army and convert it into a tool of their great-power, nationalist policy, Mao Tse-tung and his entourage first of all thoroughly purged the commanding and political personnel of the PLA. This purge began long ago and turned, as the *Liberation Army Daily*, the central military newspaper, writes, into three 'big battles' over military development. The first was fought at the enlarged meeting of the Military Council of the CPC Central Committee in 1958; the second in 1959, and the third, according to the newspaper, occurred quite recently.

Against whom were these 'big battles' directed? *Liberation Army Daily* asserts that they were directed against 'representatives of the bourgeoisie who made their way to important posts in the army'. But it is well known that these posts were held not by representatives of the bourgeoisie but by representatives of the working class, the working people of China, those who had passed through the great school of armed struggle for the victory of the Chinese revolution.

The same paper further says that these socalled 'representatives of the bourgeoisie' sought to steer the PLA 'on to the road of bourgeois

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armies' and to reduce the tasks of the army to one aim—'military exercises in peacetime and military operations in wartime'. But it is similarly well known that the people who held leading posts in the PLA, in the recent past sought to direct the development of China's army not along the bourgeois but along the socialist path, and to convert it into a strong, regular, fully modern army really capable of waging successful operations in conditions of any war against the imperialist aggressors. In their overwhelming majority these were experienced military leaders, communists, who sought to build up and consolidate the fighting efficiency of the PLA, taking into account its national distinctions and revolutionary traditions, utilising everything valuable in the development and combat activity of the Soviet army and the armies of the other socialist countries. It is against them that the 'big battles' were fought. It is these military leaders of China that the CPC leadership put in the category of 'counter-revolutionaries', 'revisionists', 'anti-socialist elements' and 'representatives of the bourgeois military line'. It was these leaders who were removed from commanding and political posts in the army. Today even the mere expression of sympathy for the USSR by Chinese servicemen is regarded by Mao Tse-tung and his group as 'national betrayal'.

Having expelled from the army servicemen who do not suit Mao Tse-tung and who disagree with his military, political, and theoretical concepts, the Chinese leaders are doing everything to enhance the role of the army in the country's entire political life and to make it a bastion of their great-power aspirations. In line with this objective, apparently, is the position now held in China by Lin Piao. He is Minister of Defence and also Chairman of the Military Council of the CPC Central Committee, which until recently was headed by Mao Tse-tung. The Chinese press calls him Mao's first comrade-in-arms and first assistant.

Statements in the Chinese press clearly indicate that the CPC leaders are trying to vest the army with functions fully conforming to their anti-Marxist and reckless course. The army, according to its main newspaper, should 'wage the class struggle and arm the broad masses with the ideas of Mao Tse-tung . . .' Servicemen are ordered to regard the spread of Mao's ideas among the masses as their duty and primary task.

The reorganisation of the party, state, and economic bodies on the army pattern serves to enhance the role of the army in applying the socalled 'proletarian policy' and in implanting the socalled 'proletarian ideology' of the CPC leadership. This reorganisation is in line with Mao Tse-tung's call: 'The entire country must learn from the People's Liberation Army'—not from the Communist Party of China, not from the Chinese working class, which have gone through a great revolutionary school and accumulated considerable experience in leading the masses . . .

This is also indicated by the role which the CPC leaders assign to the PLA in the socalled 'cultural revolution' in China. It is not by

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accident that the central army newspaper published the first big programmatic article expounding the aims of the 'cultural revolution'. The article described in detail how 'it is necessary to drag out from dark corners all who wage frenzied attacks on the party', how, 'with the help of sticks', it is necessary 'to destroy authorities' and implant the 'great ideas of Mao' in the minds of the people.

In an effort to lend the 'cultural revolution' a semblance of a mass movement from below, the Chinese leaders organised the actions of the 'Red Guards', youngsters from 14 to 18 years of age. But behind them stands the leadership of the army and state security agencies. Yang Chen-wu once said that the 'broad masses of men and commanders' of the PLA 'comprised the main force of the cultural revolution and that they would consummate it'. At a meeting of 'Red Guards' Chou En-lai announced that 16,000 PLA soldiers had been sent to 'render help' in organising that meeting. In another speech Chou En-lai said that '100,000 servicemen, mainly professional personnel, will be sent to assist the Red Guards'.

In a letter sent from the office of the CPC Central Committee and the Council of State, the 'Red Guards' were urged to 'submit to the leadership of the Liberation Army'. Army units have given the 'Red Guards' uniforms and provided instructors to teach them how to march and engage in bayonet fighting. The 'Red Guards' themselves are organised along the army pattern. The journal *Red Flag* wrote that the 'Red Guards must become a trustworthy military contingent and reserve of the People's Liberation Army.'

The following fact also shows that the army is being turned into one of the main weapons of the 'cultural revolution'. The Military Committee of the CPC Central Committee and the Central Political Department of the PLA issued in the second half of November 1966 'special instructions' how to carry out the 'cultural revolution' in military academies and schools. . . . Later on, a supplementary directive noted that the 'special instructions of the Military Committee and the Central Political Department . . . played an important part . . . in advancing the great proletarian cultural revolution'.

The Soviet press has described in detail what the 'cultural revolution' represents. But the question arises: why have the Chinese leaders in effect made the army the directing force of this 'revolution'? Why have the working class, toiling peasantry, and the mass of communists in the countryside and cities been kept out of this 'revolution'? There can be only one answer: what is happening in China under the name of a 'cultural revolution' has nothing in common either with a real cultural revolution or the interests of the Communist Party of China or the interests of the Chinese workers and peasants, and flagrantly discredits the theory and practice of socialism. In the course of this 'revolution' historical, cultural, and spiritual treasures of the Chinese people, the works of the classics of world literature, are destroyed wholesale, many party committees in provinces, cities, factories, and universities, in

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

editorial offices of national and provincial newspapers and magazines are broken up. Many party leaders and statesmen, leaders in science, literature and the arts, are branded as 'black bandits', 'right-wing elements', and 'revisionists'. Frequently matters reach a point where clashes occur between industrial workers and 'Red Guards'. Many party committees were compelled to ask the workers to protect them from the outrages of the 'Red Guards'. It is not difficult to understand why the CPC leaders, in effecting such a 'cultural revolution', were compelled to rely not on the party and not on the working class, but on the army. It is the army, according to the schemes of the CPC leaders, that has to serve as their weapon for crushing those who resist the socalled 'cultural revolution' and the aims pursued in it by the Chinese leadership, aims alien to the interests of socialism.

JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Winter 1967 Vol. XXI, No. 1

Perception and Reality in World Politics

Social Myths in the 'Cold War' **REINHOLD NIEBUHR**
Learning and Reality-Testing Processes in the International System **KENNETH E. BOULDING**
Franco-American Perceptions **STANLEY HOFFMANN**
Early Origins of Sino-American Misperceptions **JOHN STOESSINGER**
Mao's Image of the World **BENJAMIN SCHWARTZ**
Cognitive Dynamics and Images of the Enemy **OLE R. HOLSTI**
Perception and Action in the 1914 Crisis **ROBERT NORTH**
Problems of Perception in Vietnam **RALPH K. WHITE**

and Reviews of Important New Books in International Relations

Single Copies, $1.50; One year subscriptions, $2.75
Two yrs., $5.00; Three yrs., $7.50; Five yrs., $12.00

Address orders to:
JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
622 West 113th Street, Room 102A, New York, New York 10025

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMMUNIST PARTIES

The so-called Cultural Revolution in China

Extracts from an article by L. Sergeyev

Agitator, October 1966.

THE events which have occurred in China in recent months have attracted the close attention of the broadest circles of people and above all of the communist and labour movement.

In the press of the fraternal parties and in their documents there has been decisive condemnation of the campaign being conducted in China under the name of the 'cultural revolution' as having nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism, as tending to discredit communist ideas and to isolate communist China, and as dealing a serious blow to the unity of the socialist camp and its struggle against imperialism.

In commenting on the reasons for and the character of the present events in China, Marxist-Leninists start from the fact that we are dealing here with fundamentally important questions which touch upon the interests of the international revolutionary movement and the interests of the peoples fighting for freedom, democracy, and progress. For this reason communists cannot remain silent on the actions of the 'Red Guards', the decisions of the eleventh plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and the slanders contained in Chinese propaganda. This is not intervention in the domestic affairs of China and the CPC, for problems which are of international significance cannot be viewed as the private concern of a single party.

As is known, the political campaign which has been called the 'cultural revolution' began in China during the summer, and is now in full swing. According to statements in Chinese newspapers, this is a 'great vital concern upon which depend the fate, prospects, and form of the CPC and the Chinese state, and also the world revolution'. The journal *Red Flag*, the theoretical organ of the central committee, has stated that this is 'a revolution unprecedented in history'.

The Chinese press has repeatedly emphasised recently that this 'revolution' began 'from the great appeal of chairman Mao Tse-tung and the central committee of the CPC and is under the direct leadership of chairman Mao'. Chinese official materials assert that its aim is to 'arm the whole people with the great ideas of Mao Tse-tung, and to see to it that the ideas of Mao Tse-tung command everything, for, departing from the ideas of Mao Tse-tung, it is impossible to have any good work'.

The Italian communist newspaper *Unita* commented on this: 'In essence, the heritage of the ideas accumulated over several centuries not only in Europe but in China itself has been proclaimed "the ideas of Mao Tse-tung", and excerpts from the works of this party leader are understood as a sort of catharsis, a collection of good rules suitable for application in all life's events and under all circumstances'.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Peking *People's Daily*, the army newspaper, and other organs of the Chinese communist press, as well as the Chinese leaders in their speeches, have stated that the 'cultural revolution' has developed because of the necessity of opposing a 'bourgeois restoration in the nation, and for waging a struggle not for life but for death between bourgeois ideas for a restoration and the struggle of the proletariat against this restoration'. This thesis has been supplemented by an appeal to wage a merciless struggle against the authorities and 'handful of counter-revolutionaries who have come to power' and who, according to the statements of the Chinese newspapers, 'are acting against chairman Mao Tse-tung and instead of carrying the great banner of the ideas of Mao Tse-tung, have raised the bourgeois black banner of liberty, equality and fraternity'. This in essence is the official Chinese version of the 'cultural revolution'.

However, the facts themselves show something quite different. The document of the central committee of the CPSU published on 1 September 1966 states that the resolutions of the eleventh plenum of the Chinese central committee which passed the decree on the 'cultural revolution' 'officially supported the intention of the CPC leaders to carry out their own particular course, in opposing it to the Marxist-Leninist line which was jointly worked out by the fraternal parties at the conferences of 1957 and 1960'.

In statements and articles in the press of the fraternal parties, a full answer has been given to the question of the reason for the events now occurring in China and what, in the words of the newspaper *Unita*, explains 'such a clearly expressed and unrestrained anti-Sovietism' and 'a deafening campaign of rabid moralism and hate for everything foreign'.

'The first answer to these questions', writes *Unita*, 'is, in turn, another question: will the "Chinese line", the anti-Soviet line which is directed above all at the Afro-Asian and Latin American "third world", be successful? This legitimate question can only be answered negatively: No . . .' The article suggests that the negative results and the bankruptcy of the 'world policy of the CPC' are the most important if not the only reason for the present political campaign in China.

The newspaper *Mundo Obrero*, the organ of the Spanish communists, analysing the goals of the 'cultural revolution', has come to the conclusion that it is nothing more than a 'putsch' directed at 'preventing the establishment of a new majority in the party consisting of people who have recently begun to move away from extremist positions'. Otherwise how can one explain the fact, the paper asks, that in a socialist nation controlled by the communists a 'street battle' is needed for carrying out the 'cultural revolution'.

In explaining why a 'street battle' is needed . . . *Unita* in one of its articles notes: 'The political struggle between the present leadership group which has turned anti-Sovietism into its own "warhorse" and the internal opposition within the CPC evidently will last much longer than

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the initiators of the " cultural revolution " may have counted on. And the results of this struggle are not yet known.'

The Swiss newspaper *La Voix Ouvrière* points out the historical features in the development of China which have helped to maintain nationalism and rabid chauvinism. But this, it emphasises, cannot justify ' the actions organised from above which border on collective insanity, the distressing and repulsive excesses of the " Red Guards ", the obsequiousness before the " instructions " of the sole leader around whom they have created not only a frenzied cult but whom in the true sense of the word they have deified '.

Many fraternal newspapers have emphasised particularly that all these actions, encouraged by the leadership of the CPC and accompanied by the persecution of anyone who tries to think for himself, are in step with the rabid anti-Sovietism expressed in unpardonable lies and provocations such as the outrages near the Soviet embassy in Peking, the threats and insults. And this is done at the very moment when there is an urgent need for unity among the socialist nations and unification of all peoples for the support of Vietnam!

What is happening in Peking and throughout China shows not the strength of the Chinese leaders, but their weakness—this is the conclusion of the international communist press in its predominant majority. And the conclusion drawn from this, which has been stated in many party announcements and editorials, is that this has nothing in common with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

La Voix Ouvrière has called the ' cultural revolution ' a tragic and ludicrous caricature of socialism, emphasising that no communist or workers party in the world can assume responsibility for such a distortion of socialism. The politbureau of the central committee of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, in a statement condemning the ' cultural revolution ' in China, points out that it causes a feeling of enormous concern and revulsion among the progressive democratic forces of the Cypriot people. Communist publicists throughout the world are writing about the deep concern, anxiety, and sense of revulsion caused by the events in China.

The communist press has pointed out that the illegal actions of the ' Red Guards ' are being repelled by the Chinese workers, and by many of the party organisations of the nation and the representatives of the Chinese community. In describing the clashes between the ' Red Guards ' and the workers, employees, and other strata of the population, the French communist newspaper *L'Humanité* has come to the conclusion that a new situation has arisen in China: ' In many places the workers and peasants, with the support of Communist Party committees, are acting against the " Red Guards " and " revolutionary students ", sometimes responding to violence with violence.' This fact has also been pointed out by the weekly of the Italian Communist Party, *Rinascita.*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The same idea is found in an article of the newspaper of the Yugoslav Communists League, *Komunist*, which has come out with the suggestion that there is a 'broad and possibly even a mass phenomenon of passive resistance or even active opposition to the ideas and political line which are linked to the name of Chairman Mao'. *Granma*, the organ of the central committee of the Cuban Communist Party, writes that the praise given to the ideas of Mao Tse-tung and his role in party, state, scientific, sporting, trade, agricultural, and other areas of activity 'exceeds all limits; there is nothing to compare it with'.

A member of the politbureau of the French Communist Party, Etienne Fajon, writes in *L'Humanité* that Mao Tse-tung 'has become the object of a cult which has risen to a frenzy, and every day we hear of more and more of the most unrestrained manifestations of this cult'.

The chairman of the Danish Communist Party, Knud Esperson, in a recent interview stated: 'If all this is being done in the name of socialism, then this compromises not only China but also socialism as such. Statements that the swims and bike trips made by Mao are a blow against capitalism are completely alien to us' . . .

The same ideas can be found in the speeches of the leaders of the communist parties in Ceylon, Canada, Australia, the United States, and many other countries. The general secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party of Australia emphasises, in particular, that the events in China cannot be viewed as an internal affair of that nation, 'for the Chinese leaders are trampling the ideas of communism in the mud before the entire world. The so-called "proletarian cultural revolution" is neither proletarian nor cultural, nor is it revolution. It is inspired by petty-bourgeois fanaticism. This certainly is no "cultural revolution" but obscurantism. This is the degeneration of the great Chinese revolution and a repudiation of the policy which China has followed up to now' . . .

The report approved by the plenum of the central committee of the Communist Party of Austria points out that the refusal by the Chinese leaders to conduct joint actions with all the socialist nations, and the attacks on the USSR and the other socialist states, help the actions of the aggressor. The statements and communiqués of the leading organs of the communist parties of Italy, France, Finland, Greece, Turkey, Great Britain, Luxembourg, Argentina and many other nations, and the speeches of the leaders of the socialist nations, express indignation over the growing anti-Soviet trend in the policy of the Chinese leadership; at the same time they have expressed their solidarity with the firm and principled position of the CPSU and the Soviet government, and their loyalty to international duty.

In evaluating the particular course of the Chinese leadership, the Polish newspaper *Trybuna Ludu* wrote in an editorial that 'the policy of the CPC which is directed against unity, and which for a number of years has disrupted the general anti-imperialist front of the socialist nations, and the entire rabid anti-Soviet campaign disseminated by all

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mouthpieces of Chinese propaganda, have received their official sanction in the decisions of the eleventh plenum of the Central Committee of the CPC'. 'The anti-Soviet course of Chinese policy', states *Trybuna Ludu*, 'cannot be doubted at present. The splitting action of the CPC in the international communist movement is also a confirmed fact.'

Characteristically, bourgeois propaganda from the very outset has tried to use the socalled 'great proletarian cultural revolution' in China for its own advantage. While shedding crocodile tears over the destruction of cultural treasures and other actions by the 'Red Guards', the reactionary circles of the West do everything possible to depict all this as a characteristic if not inevitable feature of socialism, so as to discredit socialism in the eyes of hundreds of millions of people. The bourgeois press constantly speculates on the recent events in China, trying to put the responsibility for them upon socialist theory and practice. But this is a misguided effort.

While condemning the actions of the Chinese leadership, the communist and workers parties will unanimously continue their consistent, principled, and unremitting struggle for unity in the international communist and workers movement.

CENTRAL ASIAN RESEARCH CENTRE

CENTRAL ASIAN REVIEW

A quarterly review of Soviet writing on Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan and the adjacent countries

The March 1967 number includes a review of
CHINESE PRESS AND RADIO COMMENTS ON SINKIANG
and articles on:
THE END OF THE KHANATE OF KHIVA
DEFINITION OF A NATION: A DISCUSSION IN "VOPROSY ISTORII"

Annual subscription: £2 15s ($8.00); single copies 13s. 6d. ($2.00)

MIZAN

A review of the policies of the Soviet Union and China towards the developing countries of Asia and Africa, with separate Supplements summarizing press reports on the Middle East and Africa (SUPPLEMENT A) and South-East Asia (SUPPLEMENT B)

The January/February 1967 number includes articles on:
HANOI AND THE VIETNAM WAR
SOVIET INFLUENCE: PROSPECTS FOR 1967

Annual subscription (six issues): MIZAN: £3 ($10.00)
SUPPLEMENTS A and B (optional): £1 10s. ($5.00) each

Orders may be placed direct with the Centre, 66A King's Road, London, S.W.3, or their agents, Messrs. Luzac & Co. Ltd., 46 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1. Sole distribution agents for MIZAN in the USA: International Publications, 303 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10010.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COLLUSION WITH THE UNITED STATES

Another Deal between the Two Nuclear Overlords, the US and the Soviet Union (extracts)

Peking Review, 18 November 1966

US imperialism and the Soviet revisionist leading group are stepping up their collaboration on the question of so-called nuclear non-proliferation and are making an eager bid to close the bargain.

In the United Nations, the US and the Soviet Union have cooked up a joint resolution calling for the achievement 'at the earliest possible time of the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons'. Outside the United Nations, they are everywhere advocating such a treaty and advertising it noisily.

This is an important component part of a major ganging up between the US and the Soviet Union on a global scale.

This is another gross betrayal by the Soviet revisionist leading group following their signing of the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty.

What is meant by nuclear non-proliferation? Why do the US and the Soviet Union need such a treaty?

So-called nuclear non-proliferation means that the nuclear weapon should be regarded as something to be monopolised by the two nuclear overlords, the US and the Soviet Union, and that only they and they alone are to possess such weapons, not anyone else. It means that others should recognise the hegemony of these two big nuclear powers and confer on US imperialism the privilege of using nuclear blackmail for aggression, and that other countries should be deprived of their right to defence by developing nuclear weapons to combat US nuclear blackmail.

The treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons jointly drawn up by the US and the Soviet Union is absolutely unjust and unfair to the other countries of the world. Whereas the US and the Soviet Union may develop nuclear weapons on a big scale and go all out for nuclear monopoly, the non-nuclear countries are not allowed to have anything whatsoever to do with nuclear weapons, not even to think of them. Nor is this all. They should sign such a document on the dotted line, pledging that they will not do so, nor think about it. Is there anything more preposterous under the sun?

The treaty is a monstrous fraud. Who, after all, is bent on nuclear proliferation? US imperialism. It is the worst nuclear proliferator in the world. It has set up numerous nuclear bases all over the globe. Its aircraft and submarines carrying nuclear warheads are prowling around continents and oceans. The treaty is in fact aimed at covering up US imperialism's nuclear proliferation and hoodwinking the people of the world.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That the Soviet leading group want to conclude such a treaty with the US is another big exposure of their renegade features. . . .

The Soviet leading group have quibbled that the signing of a treaty to prevent nuclear proliferation would do good to non-nuclear countries. Showing their 'regard' for non-nuclear countries, they allege that it is impossible for many countries to produce atomic bombs because they will impoverish themselves by doing so. According to their viewpoint, it is best for the two major nuclear powers, the US and the Soviet Union, to give the non-nuclear countries nuclear 'protection'.

What rubbish! It is the business of every country in the world to decide for itself whether to develop nuclear weapons or not. Before the realisation of complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, nobody is entitled to deprive another of the right to have nuclear weapons. No country should be treated as inferior to another even though it does not possess nuclear weapons. It is a typical manifestation of the big-nation doctrine and a typical advocacy of imperialist power politics to classify countries in the world as protectors or protectorates in accordance with having or not having nuclear weapons, and to regard those who possess the atom bomb as being privileged to lord it over others, while those without the bomb should humble themselves and pay homage to the haves. Moreover, if the so-called nuclear 'protection' comes from the United States, the result will be nothing but letting the wolf into the sheepfold; if such 'protection' is provided by the Soviet leading group, the outcome for the receiving country will merely be to put itself under the control of big-nation chauvinism. In either case, such 'protection' violates the sovereignty and interests of the non-nuclear countries and reduces their people to nuclear slaves.

The Soviet leading group have repeatedly asserted that the US war of aggression in Vietnam impedes the cooperation between the US and the Soviet Union. This is complete nonsense. Actually, not only have the Soviet leading group been all along collaborating with the United States on the Vietnam question and rendering it vigorous assistance, but they have also been making bigger and bigger political deals with the United States. The fact that the Soviet leading group are so anxious to conclude a treaty for the prevention of nuclear proliferation with the United States when the latter is unceasingly expanding its war of aggression in Vietnam further exposes the ignominy of their sham support and real betrayal of the Vietnamese people.

The sinister trafficking between the United States and the Soviet Union for a so-called nuclear non-proliferation treaty is also part of their monstrous conspiracy against China. Following China's successful guided missile nuclear weapon test, they have become more anxious than ever to clinch such a deal in order to limit the influence of China. But this will be of no avail. Our country's October 27 press communiqué points out: 'China's purpose in developing nuclear weapons is precisely to oppose the nuclear monopoly and nuclear blackmail

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the United States and the Soviet Union acting in collusion. The possession by the Chinese people of guided missiles and nuclear weapons is a great encouragement to the heroic Vietnamese people who are waging a war of resistance against US aggression and for national salvation and to all the revolutionary peoples of the world who are now engaged in heroic struggles, as well as a new contribution to the defence of world peace.' This influence of China's cannot be checked.

Washington and the bellicose rhetoric of Peking

Extracts from an article by Vladimir Zhukov

Literaturnaya Gazeta, 20 December 1966

In the last two years there has been a growing demand in the USA for a revision of Washington's policy towards the Chinese People's Republic (CPR). In contrast with previous years, the need to revise relations with the CPR is now being advocated by authoritative leaders with considerable weight in the making of foreign policy.

At the end of 1964, the *New York Times* carried a long article by a former American diplomatist, now a professor at Princeton University, George Kennan. Analysing Washington's policy towards the CPR, Kennan concluded that the 'tough course' which was right in the past had outlived its usefulness and that today Washington would need to work out a new approach to American-Chinese relations. A most encouraging fact for the USA has appeared in the international arena over the past twenty years: the position of Mao-Tse-tung and his close associates with respect to the world communist movement.

Kennan's theoretical argument has not remained an unheeded voice in the wilderness. On 28 April 1965, that is shortly after the American Air Force's piratical raids on the territory of the Vietnam Democratic Republic (VDR), about 1,000 businessmen gathered at a congress of the big American monopolists' organisation, the US Chamber of Commerce, and unanimously voted in favour of a resolution urging the Government to 'study steps which would lead to an effective opening of communication channels' between the USA and the CPR.

A few weeks later a special report of the Far East and Pacific Affairs sub-commission of the House of Representatives' Foreign Affairs Committee was published. Noting that the position of Peking 'is of tremendous significance to the struggle between the communist and non-communist world', the sub-commission recommended the US Government to revise its old course with respect to that country.

Following the recommendation of the Chamber of Commerce and the House sub-commission, a chain reaction followed in Congress, in newspapers, and in influential political circles of the USA. A paradoxical situation developed: the escalation of the Vietnam adventure was accompanied by a kind of escalation of demands by influential

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

circles of the ruling class to abandon the old 'tough' policy towards the CPR. The Washington strategists are calculating, not without good reason, that the logic of the struggle against the Soviet Union, to use Senator McGovern's words, will increase China's gravitation towards contacts with the Western countries and recommend that this trend should be encouraged . . . All the enticing proposals now being made to Peking from the USA are no more than a gesture designed to demonstrate to the Peking group of splitters that if they make still greater efforts to inflame hostility against the Soviet Union they can expect something very real in return.

The advocates of the 'new approach' to the CPR point to the fact that the situation that has now arisen in Peking favours their schemes, that the Peking leaders are themselves seeking contacts with the USA. Those who advocate revision of policy towards the CPR suggest that Peking's bellicose rhetoric with regard to the USA should not be taken seriously.

The 'great cultural revolution' in China, accompanied by a sharp intensification of anti-Soviet propaganda, has aroused unconcealed satisfaction in the entire ruling class of the USA. The *New York Times* has pointed out that the Chinese leaders decided to make the Soviet Union Public Enemy No. 1 at a time when the escalation of the war in Vietnam was at its height.

In Washington there has been an obvious increase of interest in the meetings between the American and Chinese Ambassadors in Warsaw. This is borne out by, among other things, an article by the former American diplomatist Kenneth Young, published in the influential *Foreign Affairs*. 'By means of these talks', Young writes, 'Washington has probably been maintaining more prolonged diplomatic contacts and a more varied dialogue with the Peking Government than any of the non-communist western Governments which have embassies in Peking'. . . . It is clear from Young's article that each step in the American escalation in Vietnam has been undertaken only after careful sounding of the reaction it would call forth in Peking.

In his turn, the CPR Foreign Minister Chen Yi, in an interview with representatives of the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party, put a high value on the American-Chinese contacts in Warsaw and emphasised that he 'did not necessarily exclude the idea of talks with the USA' . . .

The reactionary American press notes with satisfaction Peking's 'special position' in the Vietnam question. Such is the true value of Peking's bellicose rhetoric about imperialism as a whole and about American imperialism in particular. When put to the test this rhetoric turns out to be nothing more than a smoke-screen designed to conceal the readiness of the CPR leaders to embark on a course of rapprochement with the USA and with other imperialist countries, which find the present position of Mao Tse-tung and his group quite to their taste. The only practical result of such a rapprochement is a sell-out of the interest of the other socialist countries and of the CPR's neighbours.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DIPLOMATIC PROTESTS

Note from the Soviet Foreign Ministry

Izvestiya, 28 October 1966

On 27 October 1966, at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Chargé d'Affaires of the Chinese People's Republic, Chang Te-chiun, was given a note with the following contents:

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, upon instruction from its government, states to the Embassy of the Chinese People's Republic in Moscow the following:

The Soviet Embassy in Peking for several days has been subject to new provocative and insulting actions by organised groups of Chinese citizens who have acted outrageously.

Since 23 October, the entrance to the Soviet embassy has been blocked. From the crowd which has gathered at the gates of the embassy threats and insults have been shouted against the Soviet diplomats and also foreign guests who have visited the Soviet embassy. Those participating in the disorders have behaved like hooligans, indulging in unrestrained abuse, making obscene gestures, spitting, and the like. Things reached such a point that on 23 October certain foreign diplomats were not able to leave the Soviet embassy in cars with foreign plates for their residence, and were forced to turn back from the blockaded street to the territory of the Soviet embassy.

The outrages in front of the Soviet embassy which have impeded its normal activities have been carried out before the very eyes of Chinese policemen, who not only did not stop the hooligan outbursts but by their behaviour helped these actions.

The organisation of new provocations in front of the Soviet embassy is nothing more than another deliberate step by the Chinese side designed at further exacerbating Soviet-Chinese international relations.

This is not the first instance when mass disorders have been organised in front of the Soviet Embassy having an overtly anti-Soviet nature and carried out with the connivance and support of the Chinese official representatives, and this in particular was brought to the attention of the Chinese government in a note to the Embassy of the Chinese People's Republic in Moscow, of 26 August 1966.

One cannot help but get the impression that the flagrant violations of generally accepted principles of relationships between states, the elementary norms of international law, and the immunity of diplomatic representatives in communist China, are becoming a more or less customary practice.

In making a decisive protest against such actions by the Chinese side, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs insists upon its demand that the Chinese authorities take immediate and effective measures to stop the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outrages in front of the Soviet Embassy and to provide normal conditions for its activity.

Statement by the Soviet Ministry of the Merchant Marine (extract)

Moscow Radio, 2 January 1967

On 8 December 1966 the Chinese authorities of Port Dalny unlawfully detained the Soviet motor-vessel Zagorsk and kept her under arrest until 28 December. In order to justify their actions, which grossly violate the generally-accepted principles and practices laid down by the legislation of shipping nations, including the regulations in force in the port of Dalny, the authorities of this port charged the Soviet ship absolutely groundlessly with 'violation of port regulations'.

What really happened to the Soviet ship Zagorsk in Port Dalny? Moored to quay No. 28, the Zagorsk finished loading cargo on 8 December and, having completed all the necessary formalities, made ready to put to sea. Two Chinese pilots boarded the vessel at 16.10 hours. They gave the order to cast off and steered the Zagorsk towards the mouth of the harbour. Neither the skipper of the Soviet ship nor the other members of the crew interfered with the actions of the Chinese pilots until, in the immediate vicinity of the port entrance, the pilots suddenly ordered the motorship to turn about. Compliance with this command would have inevitably resulted in the Zagorsk's colliding with the pier, with the grave danger of a serious accident or even the sinking of the vessel.

In this situation the master of the Zagorsk could not and, of course, should not have carried out the pilot's command. The ship was thus enabled to pass safely through the gates of the port, after which the master immediately stopped the ship and anchored her at the request of the Chinese pilots. When the ship had been anchored, armed Chinese guards and representatives of the port authorities came on board, prohibited any further movement of the ship, and tried by force to break into the navigation office to seize maps and the ship's papers . . .

Despite the repeated requests of the Zagorsk's master to the port administration to investigate the case with the participation of members of the Soviet ship's crew and the Chinese pilots who were on board, the representatives of the port authorities categorically refused to carry out any investigation and continued to detain the Soviet ship. These absolutely groundless and provocative actions of the Chinese authorities are unprecedented, the more so in relations between socialist nations.

On 10 December the Soviet Embassy in Peking asked the Foreign Ministry of the Chinese People's Republic to facilitate the sailing of the Zagorsk from the port of Dalny. A spokesman of the CPR Foreign Ministry, however, deliberately exaggerating the concocted charges against the Soviet seamen, alleged that the Zagorsk had 'violated the sovereignty of China'. The Chinese authorities continued to insist on

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their demands, and the ship and its crew were guarded in the outer roadstead of Port Dalny.

On 17 December the Soviet authorities lodged with the CPR Embassy in Moscow a protest against the illegal detention of the Zagorsk and demanded her immediate release. The statement fully exposed the charges against the ship's master and other Soviet sailors, invented by the Chinese authorities. It pointed out, specifically, that according to generally accepted international standards and practices, laid down in the legislation of shipping nations, the pilot is an adviser, a consultant of a ship's master. Regardless of the presence of a pilot on board, the ship's master is not stripped of responsibility for steering the ship during manoeuvring, and he bears full responsibility for the safety of the ship entrusted to him. According to Chinese official data, this is also the practice in the ports of the Chinese People's Republic. Neither the navigational instructions nor the local regulations of Port Dalny contain any restriction of the master's rights when a pilot is on board. . . .

Far from taking any steps to release the ship, however, the Chinese side did not even reply to the statement of 17 December made to the CPR Embassy in Moscow. In this connection, the Soviet authorities again lodged a resolute protest on 24 December against the detention of the Soviet ship. Only after this were the Chinese authorities compelled on 28 December to let the Soviet ship Zagorsk leave the port. To conceal from world public opinion the true nature of their actions they are now trying, by distorting facts, to find in retrospect justification for the unlawful 20-day detention of the Soviet ship and its crew. This is precisely the purpose of the 28 December report of the New China News Agency which was circulated widely in the press and broadcast by the radio of the CPR. The unseemly aims of this report are perfectly obvious.

The USSR Ministry of the Merchant Marine cannot but draw attention to the fact that the actions of the Chinese authorities are incompatible with generally-accepted principles of relations governing the navigation of merchant ships, seriously prejudice co-operation between Soviet and Chinese seamen, and jeopardise normal shipping between the ports of the USSR and China.

The USSR Ministry of the Merchant Marine reserves the right to demand from the appropriate authorities of the Chinese People's Republic compensation for the losses caused by the unlawful detention of the Zagorsk for a long period.

Protest by the Chinese Foreign Ministry against Soviet atrocities

New China News Agency, Peking, 26 January 1967

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China issued a statement today protesting most vehemently against the fascist

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

atrocities committed by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique, which on 25 January despatched troops, police, and plain-clothes special agents to suppress savagely the Chinese students studying in Europe who were going to lay wreaths at Lenin's mausoleum and Stalin's tomb.

> *The socialist system will eventually replace the capitalist system; this is an objective law independent of man's will. However much the reactionaries try to hold back the wheel of history, sooner or later revolution will take place and will inevitably triumph.*
>
> Mao Tse-tung

On 25 January 1967, with feelings of boundless respect for the great revolutionary teacher of the proletariat Lenin and the great Marxist-Leninist Stalin, sixty-nine Chinese students returning from Europe via Moscow were proceeding in an orderly column to Lenin's mausoleum and Stalin's tomb to lay wreaths and were reading out quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the reddest, reddest red sun in the hearts of the revolutionary people of the world, to express their boundless faith in and boundless love for Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought.

This action of the Chinese students was an entirely revolutionary one. It was fine! All revolutionary students, youths and people of China and the world, including those of the Soviet Union, will warmly support and praise them.

However, these Chinese students were subjected to barbarous suppression by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique. When they were reading out quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the Soviet government called out two or three hundred soldiers, policemen, and plain-clothesmen planted there in advance to encircle and savagely assault them, injuring over thirty of them with four seriously wounded, of whom one is in a critical state with broken ribs.

The Chinese government and people express the utmost indignation at this fascist atrocity by the Soviet revisionist ruling clique and lodge the most vehement protest against it.

In savagely suppressing the Chinese students before Lenin's mausoleum and Stalin's tomb, the Soviet revisionist ruling clique has once again revealed their features as renegades from Marxism-Leninism. Listen, you chieftains of Soviet revisionism, Brezhnev, Kosygin and the like: all those who suppress student movements, all those who enforce fascist rule over the people, and all those who betray the revolution will come to no good end! The German, Italian, and Japanese fascists came to no good end. Chiang Kai-shek came to no good end. The Tsar of Russia came to no good end. Kautsky came to no good end. Khrushchev came to no good end. And you will definitely come to no good end either! This is not the first time that Chinese students have shed their

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blood on the streets of Moscow. A new debt has been incurred before the old ones are cleared. All these debts must be repaid in full!

This sanguinary atrocity of the Soviet revisionist ruling clique is by no means accidental. Ever since the great proletarian cultural revolution was launched in China, the Soviet revisionist ruling clique, working in collusion with American imperialism, has set its entire propaganda machine in motion turning out a torrent of slanderous attacks. The chieftains of Soviet revisionism have been running hither and thither and barking furiously and incessantly at socialist China, the great Chinese Communist Party, and the great leader Chairman Mao Tse-tung. This shows that because it deals blows at the handful of persons within the CCP who are in authority and are taking the capitalist road, the great proletarian cultural revolution in China gives pain to the Soviet revisionist ruling clique and American imperialism, touching them to the very quick and hitting them where it hurts most. That is why they have hastily come forward with blatant counter-attacks to stir up a new anti-Chinese tide.

A small contingent of sixty and more students had hardly read two passages from the bright red booklet *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung* in their hands, before you were frightened out of your wits and went so far as to call out two or three hundred fully-armed soldiers, policemen and special agents to suppress them by force. This demonstrates most graphically how powerful the great thought of Mao Tse-tung is and how miserably flabby you revisionists are. Like American imperialism, you are paper tigers, pure and simple.

To tell you bluntly, the revolutionary students and youths and the 700 million people of China armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought are not to be trifled with! 'Only heroes can quell tigers and leopards, and wild bears never daunt the brave'. Since we dread neither heaven nor earth, neither devils nor gods, how can we possibly dread you, a few flies freezing to death in the whirling snow? You revisionist overlords! Come out with all the tricks you may still have! . . . The present era is one in which ever-victorious Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, is shining with its radiance all over the globe, and world revolution is surging forward. Although the sky over the Soviet Union is temporarily covered with dark clouds, we are deeply convinced that they will be dispersed by the storm of revolution, that the great Soviet people, with the glorious tradition of the October revolution, will never tolerate such tyranny of the revisionist ruling clique, and that the day is bound to come when they will rise in rebellion against the revisionist rulers, dismiss them from office, seize power from them and smash the revisionist regime to smithereens. A brilliantly red, new, and revolutionary Soviet Union will certainly emerge before the people of the whole world!

The Soviet revisionist ruling clique is bound to be defeated!

Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, is sure to triumph!

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Protest to China

Izvestiya, 31 January 1967

The Soviet Foreign Ministry today presented to the embassy of the Chinese People's Republic in Moscow the following note:

The Soviet Foreign Ministry makes the following statement to the embassy of the Chinese People's Republic:

Anti-Soviet provocations by organised groups of Chinese citizens against the Soviet embassy in Peking began again on 26 January. There was rude swearing, slanders, hostile outcries and threats against the Soviet embassy and government. Riotous mobs blocked the entrance to the territory of the embassy, barring the road to the embassy's automobiles. They threw paint on them and struck them with sticks, thus making them unfit for use. Unbridled hooligans prevented Soviet people from leaving the territory of the embassy and visitors from entering it. They created a situation in which the embassy is unable to proceed with its normal activities.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry notes to the embassy of the Chinese People's Republic of 26 August and 27 October 1966 already pointed to the fact that such wild sallies clearly have a provocative nature, that they are deliberate and made with the knowledge and encouragement of the Chinese authorities.

Judging by the facts, these anti-Soviet demonstrations outside the Soviet embassy in Peking have become systematic, are specially planned, and have the purpose of further aggravating Soviet-Chinese relations. This is specifically proved by the fact that the disturbances that began in Peking on 26 January were preceded by provocative actions by a large group of Chinese citizens in Red Square in Moscow on 25 January, organised by the embassy of the Chinese People's Republic. Nobody has any doubts that the recent outrages outside the Soviet embassy in Peking are not only encouraged but also organised by the Chinese authorities.

On behalf of the Soviet government, the Soviet Foreign Ministry makes a strong protest in this connection and expects the embassy of the Chinese People's Republic to transmit immediately the demand of the Soviet government for protection of the Soviet embassy from hostile demonstrations which disrupt its normal work and threaten the safety of its staff. The Foreign Ministry also insists on compensation for material damage caused to the embassy by the actions of these hooligans.

The Soviet side reserves the right to take the necessary measures if the Chinese authorities fail to create the conditions for the normal activity of the Soviet mission.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Protest to the Chinese Embassy in Moscow (extracts)

Moscow Radio, 4 February 1967

Events which have taken place in the Chinese People's Republic of late attest to the intention of the present Chinese leadership to carry matters to a further deterioration and aggravation of relations with the Soviet Union.

The Chinese authorities, exploiting the anti-Soviet political provocation staged in Moscow's Red Square on 25 January this year by the embassy of the Chinese People's Republic, are fanning hostile anti-Soviet hysteria and carrying it to the extreme form of rude high-handedness and direct physical violence against officials of the embassy of the USSR, employees of other Soviet institutions, and Soviet citizens in the Chinese People's Republic.

The press of the Chinese People's Republic is systematically, day by day, publishing slanderous anti-Soviet articles and unbridled slogans which it is difficult to assess otherwise than as a direct incitement of the population of Peking and other Chinese towns to perpetrate outrages against Soviet representatives and to commit violence against Soviet citizens.

Since 26 January this year rallies have been taking place outside the Soviet embassy day and night and demonstrations and processions have been organised, which have been of a sharply expressed, hostile, anti-Soviet nature. The demonstrations are attended by crude abuse of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people; threats are being shouted of 'overthrowing' the Soviet Government and 'making short work' of statesmen and political leaders of the USSR.

A rampaging mob of Chinese citizens, deceived by anti-Soviet propaganda, is rioting outside the Soviet embassy and lighting fires in which it burns pictures of Soviet people. The mob throws torches onto the territory of the Soviet embassy, creating the danger of a fire. The cynicism of what is now taking place in Peking surpasses even the actions of the Chiang Kai-shek authorities in the grimmest period of their reactionary rule.

Despite the protests and demands of the Soviet side through diplomatic channels, the government of the Chinese People's Republic took no steps to stop these outrages. More than that, the Chinese authorities defend such outrages and even try to pass them off as 'activities of the revolutionary masses'.

In full conformity with this position of the Chinese authorities, scandalous new acts of lawlessness and violence were committed against officials of the embassy and employees of other Soviet institutions in Peking on 2 February 1967. On that day provocateurs detained in a street of the Chinese capital two cars in which Soviet diplomatists were proceeding on official business to the Civil Aviation Agency of the Chinese People's Republic to purchase tickets for women and children,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members of the families of officials of the embassy and other Soviet institutions in Peking, who were returning home in view of the unbearable conditions created for them in China. For 16 hours the raging crowd subjected this group of Soviet diplomatists to foul mockery, insults, threats of physical violence, and other methods of psychological terror.

The embassy of the USSR immediately notified the Foreign Ministry of the Chinese People's Republic of these outrages against Soviet people. The Soviet Chargé d'Affaires in Peking more than once demanded a meeting with a representative of the Foreign Ministry. However, this official agency of the Chinese government, whose duty it is to ensure normal conditions for the activity of foreign missions, far from taking any steps, on the contrary, virtually became an accomplice in this provocation. The Soviet Chargé d'Affaires was ostentatiously refused a meeting with any official of the Ministry, and the telephones, by which the Soviet embassy tried to contact the Foreign Ministry, were even disconnected. . . .

All these actions, without precedent in the history of diplomatic relations, against official representatives of another State, took place in an atmosphere not only of connivance but also of direct incitement by Chinese officials and institutions. Moreover, the facts show that official Chinese authorities were the organisers of these provocations. . . .

The Soviet Government lodges with the Government of the Chinese People's Republic a resolute protest against the lawlessness and arbitrary actions against Soviet citizens in Peking. It categorically insists that the Chinese authorities, in conformity with the generally accepted standards of international law, should take the most urgent steps to ensure the complete safety of officials of the embassy of the USSR and other Soviet institutions in Peking and members of their families, and should punish severely the organisers of the provocations against Soviet citizens and give a guarantee that there will be no repetition of such actions in the future.

The Government of the Chinese People's Republic bears the entire responsibility for the possible consequences of acts of lawlessness committed against the Soviet embassy and citizens of the Soviet Union on the territory of the Chinese People's Republic.

The actions of the Chinese authorities arouse the just indignation of Soviet people. The Soviet Government deems it necessary to warn the Chinese Government that the restraint and patience of the Soviet people are not without limits.

The Soviet Union reserves the right to take steps, appropriate to the situation, to preserve the safety of its citizens and its lawful interests.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHINESE ROAD TO SOCIALISM FOR RUSSIA AND POLAND

IN its 'theoretical' formulations, the Sino-Soviet dispute has been mainly concerned with the external aspects of the policies pursued by the respective parties. It was the international 'general line' of the CPSU and the CPC which was the chief target of their mutual criticisms. But later it was their internal policies that increasingly became the target of specific attacks. Here, the Chinese were more explicit than the Russians in elaborating their theoretical platform against their opponents. They no longer needed to engage in the esoteric ambivalence originally exemplified in their reaction to Khrushchev's 'secret speech', formulated in their 1956 resolutions 'On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat' and 'Once again on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat'.

There is no longer any point in nuances and qualification; Stalin's rule is now praised without any equivocation by the Chinese and their followers. 'The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution' put a final stamp on the thesis about the internal degeneration of the Soviet Union. The dethronement of Stalin is now presented as leading to the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. For Trotsky, Stalin embodied the 'bureaucratic deformation' of the Soviet state; for Mao the abandonment of some of his policies by his successors implies that the party bureaucracy has succumbed to capitalism.

Soviet broadsides against the Chinese 'cultural revolution' are handicapped by many 'theoretical' embarrassments. The ambivalences of the post-Khrushchev line on Stalin prevent Moscow from facing squarely the Soviet past in a way which would permit it to face squarely the Chinese present. It is possible to describe the excesses of the Chinese 'cultural revolution', but it is difficult to condemn it 'theoretically' without at the same time raising again the question of Stalin, the question which the present leaders are trying to shelve in the attempt to de-fuse Khrushchev's time-bomb.

The two documents reproduced below in an abridged form are the 'Programmes' of the unknown pro-Chinese Soviet communists and of the known pro-Chinese Polish communists. It can be assumed that they reflect the present Chinese position vis-à-vis the political history and prospects of the Soviet Union and Poland. They mark the escalation of the 'theoretical' dispute to the point where programmes are formulated against the internal policies of the present rulers of Poland and the Soviet Union. They have of course no greater chance of becoming influential, much less of being implemented, than a similar document published a long time ago by an alleged group of pro-Chinese Yugoslav communists. Their appeals have no significant support in the countries in question and no political future.

But although the two programmes present only a farrago of old dogmas and new demagoguery, they are in some respects interesting:

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They are an aspect of the Sino-Soviet dispute and they are designed to have a wider appeal than the one rooted in the nostalgia of the remaining 'Stalin's orphans'. The Polish document, for instance, makes direct anti-semitic references, calls for a policy of reconciliation with the Church, etc. The pro-Chinese group which adopted this 'programme' also distributes leaflets with a 'new map of Poland' (reproduced below), which includes Vilno, Minsk, and Kiev.

Another interesting aspect of the two documents is that in their curious mixture of mendacity and truthfulness they refer to various taboo subjects, like the Moscow Trials or unemployment in Poland, which cannot be mentioned in the two countries; this contrasts with the evasive doubletalk of their opponents on these and other politically sensitive topics. On the other hand, the Belgian pro-Chinese communist paper, La Voix du Peuple *(25 March 1966), which reproduced these documents, omitted from the Polish 'Programme' passages with anti-semitic accents. Referring to the Soviet 'revolutionary communists' who allegedly are distributing their 'Programme' in the Soviet Union,* La Voix du Peuple *(30 December 1966) mentioned that it received the document through the offices of the Albanian press agency. The Polish document, a 64-page brochure, is distributed clandestinely in Poland. Its author, the old Stalinist K. Mijal, who escaped to Albania, has changed his previous pro-Soviet into a pro-Chinese position and now regularly broadcasts in Polish from Tirana radio.*

For the Soviet Union

A decisive moment in the evolution of the communist movement is approaching. At a time when each communist party has to take independently the historic decision to follow either the road of revolutionary Marxism or that of opportunism, it is proper that communists throughout the world should hear the voice of their Soviet comrades.

The decisions and statements of the present leaders of the CPSU purport to express the opinions of those comrades. But anyone who knows anything about the internal life of our country, who has seen anything of the mass of the people and of ordinary party members, must know that these decisions and statements not only do not express the convictions and true aspirations of the great majority of Soviet citizens and members of the CPSU, but are totally opposed to them. . . .

It is very hard to understand this complicated situation from outside. But it must be studied from both the practical and the theoretical point of view. We have to do with a manifestation of the 'internal' danger, most serious of all for the communist movement, which will continue to threaten us throughout the period of the transition from capitalism to communism. An understanding of the position of the opportunists within the USSR will help the communist and workers' parties of the world to form a better judgment of these people's intrigues in the international field, their hypocrisy vis-à-vis revolutionary and liberation movements, and the way in which they distort the conception of the fight for peace.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The question of the 'personality cult'

It is, we think, unnecessary to prove at length that the whole complex of contradictions in the present-day communist movement revolves around the question of the 'personality cult', since each of the disputing parties considers this question as a touchstone of fidelity towards Marxism-Leninism. This state of affairs is natural, because we have to do with the first experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Until this question is cleared up, the communist movement cannot march forward.

Directly after the twentieth congress of the CPSU, the critics of the 'personality cult' succeeded in deceiving numerous communists owing to the sensational character and apparent truth of their denunciations. Even then, however, the opportunists did not manage to convince the most resolute and experienced fighters among the proletariat. Such comrades as these, and particularly those of China and Albania, saw through the vile and slanderous character of the campaign launched by the leaders of the CPSU. Subsequent years showed what enormous harm had been done to the communist movement by the acts of opportunists who were incapable of solving its basic problems. Recent events show clearly the demagogic nature of opportunist appeals concerning the 'personality cult', and their counter-revolutionary and anti-marxist character.

In fact, the opportunists began by criticising the 'personality cult' as applied to Stalin and ended by criticising it as applied to Khrushchev. It cannot surely be simply a question of Khrushchev, whom the opportunists exalted as a 'great Marxist' and were not prepared to sacrifice to anyone, being proclaimed guilty of the same crime for which he criticised Stalin. However that may be, the example of Khrushchev showed up the absurdity of the opportunists' position and of their references to the 'personality cult', whereby they ignore the social explanation of the forms taken by the dictatorship of the proletariat and prefer the subjective concept of the domination of one man in the socialist state. To talk thus is to have lost all sense of historical materialism. . . .

A picture for petty-bourgeois intellectuals

. . . But—the opportunists will say—it is a fact that over a long period Stalin was the all-powerful head of the Soviet state and the CPSU and that hymns were sung to his glory. We do not deny it by any means. But how can people who claim to be Marxists maintain that this came about by chance, contrary to the will of the party, so that the party and people were building socialism in opposition to Stalin and without him? How can it be supposed that a man based on no social group and representing no class could, by mere force of mind and character, succeed for thirty years in leading a whole state and party by the nose? The critics of the 'personality cult' who believe in the possibility of such an extraordinary exercise of abitrary power, and of its going unpunished, exalt Stalin to the rank of a superman—in short, they abandon Marxism and themselves embrace the doctrine of the 'personality' [cult]. . . .

Refuse in the stream

It must be emphasised that the need for social analysis is clearly admitted by the majority of Soviet communists. Here too, one perceives

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the effect of the great school of Marxist education through which they have passed. Immediately after the twentieth congress, at general meetings, all those members of the party who had criticised the decisions of the twentieth congress demanded that the central committee should undertake a truly Marxist evaluation of Stalin's activity. This demand was so insistent that the CPSU leaders were obliged to persecute various members of the party and to dissolve a number of party organisations which were presenting an especially solid front. Later, in 1957, at party meetings, all those who had criticised the decisions of the twentieth congress were obliged to make acts of repentance. But public opinion, even when silenced, was so formidable in its unity that the opportunists resorted to extreme measures. Opposing their own 'humane' attitude to Stalin's 'toughness', they rehabilitated, without any prior check or judicial procedure, all political internees, making play with the latter's injured feelings and restoring their voting rights. And, as this did not suffice, fresh amnesties were proclaimed in favour of gangsters who had terrorised society more than once. This so-called policy was crowned by Khrushchev's meeting with one of the repentant gangsters, who was generously rewarded for 'deciding' to turn honest. General indignation soon obliged the official press to put an end to admiring descriptions of this 'humane act'. But so much refuse had been thrown into the stream that its waters remained muddy for some time. This activity was greatly helped by survivors of the old order who, for forty years, had had to conceal their views and true feelings and who suddenly were given a chance openly to vent their wrath against the dictatorship of the proletariat. Literature became the chief field of their machinations, and this is where the new corruption was soon to be most clearly displayed.

But despite the activity of these 'opponents of the personality cult', the opportunists realised that the whole people could not be caught in this snare. Criticism of Stalin must at all costs be reinforced with arguments that sounded like good Marxism. A man guilty of so many sins cannot be Marxist-Leninist in theory. If he were, it would be the most astonishing thing in the world. Realising this, the opportunists and their trained flunkeys have, for over ten years, been combing the works of Stalin for theories, or at any rate particular theses, or at the very least particular allusions, contrary to Marxism-Leninism. They look for these, but they do not find them.

They began by ridiculing the philosophical chapter of Stalin's *Short History of the CPSU*, on the sole ground that the number of particular features of the dialectic presented by Stalin was raised from four to twelve, thus making them difficult to apply and even to remember. They then sought to criticise his *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, but, finding nothing to their purpose, were obliged to desist. Having rejected in every way Stalin's articles on linguistics, they finally stated merely that these contained 'exaggerations'. They acted similarly in dozens of other cases and in the most diverse fields: one successful appeal and exposé after another, but always ending up with the Lilliputians collapsing exhausted at Gulliver's feet. . . .

Stalin and proletarian democracy

If we sum up all the accusations which the opportunists level against Stalin, they can for the most part be brought under the heading 'violation

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of proletarian democracy'. According to the opportunists, Stalin usurped power in the country and party and liquidated the best and ablest cadres of workers in both party and state.

These men buttress their criticism of Stalin by the example of Lenin, which they consider the best and clearest argument on their side. We do indeed agree that this comparison illuminates the question—but in a sense unfavourable to the opportunists. 'Inconsistency—brutality—dictatorial errors'—where do we find this vocabulary? Are these words quoted from *Pravda* articles of the last few years about the 'personality cult'? No, they were originally the stock-in-trade of Lenin's opportunist critics at the time of the Russian revolution.

Why do the present leaders of the CPSU not recall that all the errors with which Stalin is charged were once ascribed to Lenin? What a metamorphosis! If the modern revisionists are to be believed, Lenin was almost an adherent of the doctrine that evil should not be resisted by violence. In order to decry Stalin's revolutionary tactics, as they are at all costs bent upon doing, the opportunists are prepared to forget the past and to depict Lenin in what they would consider an ennobled form. 'We are Jacobins on the side of the proletariat'—these words of Lenin should be well understood by all who nowadays seek to present him as Jesus Christ. . . .

The party and the people—confidence in Stalin!

Using this cloak for their opportunist activity, the petty-bourgeois ideologists endeavour also to misrepresent the party's internal democracy. We may recall the innumerable discussions inflicted on the party by the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries at the most crucial stage of the revolution, whereby much valuable time and strength was wasted. It was not Stalin but Lenin who sponsored the famous decision of the tenth congress forbidding the formation of factions within the party. From a formal point of view, this was no doubt a 'violation of democracy'.

In order to understand how and why so much power was concentrated in Stalin's hands, it is instructive to look at the situation which arose at the fifteenth party congress. Reading the stenographic record, one is amazed by what took place. The members of the opposition asked that an elementary democratic attitude should be adopted towards them; they wanted a straight exchange of views, but the congress as a whole shouted: 'Down with the opposition—long live Stalin.' This, however, represented not the stifling, but the affirmation of proletarian democracy. The congress was defending the revolutionary cause against petty-bourgeois phrase-making. And the defender of the cause was Stalin, who, for the first time, posed firmly and decisively the question of building socialism in one country, evinced the historic determination to put agriculture on the rails of socialist construction by means of general collectivisation, and directed the industrialisation of the country.

The party and people trusted Stalin. Is such trust in leaders necessary at the present stage? Everyone who calls himself a Marxist must realise that democracy, like all other social phenomena, must be regarded in a historical and concrete fashion. In its initial phase, proletarian democracy, especially in a backward country such as Russia was, must be expressed in the maximum centralisation of power. The proletariat

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resorted to such centralisation in the face of mortal danger, in circumstances of a most violent class struggle, in the same way as military discipline is imposed at the battlefront. . . .

The 'persecutions'

This brings us to the question of Stalin's 'persecutions'. The opportunist gentry, seeking to disguise the social basis of these persecutions, depict Stalin as a man who, fearing competition, caused the arrest and execution of everyone who seemed to him possessed of ability.

This, of course, is quite unfounded, even as regards the circles closest to Stalin. Otherwise the members of the opportunist clique would have to admit that they themselves survived Stalin's time only because of their intellectual insignificance! It is all the more ridiculous to offer this explanation of 'persecutions' of workers at a lower level whom Stalin had no chance to know personally.

To all those who do not preach the principle of non-resistance to evil, physical response to physical attack is comprehensible. But matters are more complicated in politics, where the direct results of a particular act may not be felt for decades. Was it right to build up Soviet industry at the cost of incredible efforts and privations? Was Stalin right when he said: 'We must do so or they will crush us'?

We believe that the best reply to this question must come from the soldiers of the patriotic war who wielded the arms forged by Stalinist industry. And it was precisely against industrialisation that the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries rebelled. Their cry was that agriculture was being sacrificed for industry. In effect, therefore, they wanted to see the Russian peasantry enslaved to fascism. Stalin 'persecuted' the main body of petty-bourgeois ideologists who were two-faced and concealed their real identity from the bolsheviks.

That is the true meaning of the famous 'Moscow trials'. Stalin freed Russia from its fifth column.

In order to understand the attention that Stalin devoted in his actions to the problem of the evolution of fascism, we would point out that fascism as a social movement was a direct response by the European bourgeoisie to the October revolution.

One can only feel indignation and contempt at the efforts of the opportunist leaders of the CPSU to whitewash the Menshevik and SR traitors and deny the facts about their direct links with the German fascists. The opportunists do not mention Trotsky—he was too well known as a potential Russian *Führer*. But, in Khrushchev's time, there were persistent though veiled attempts to rehabilitate Bukharin.

The value of such rehabilitations appears clearly from another example—that of Tukhachevsky, a political charlatan whom Trotsky and Bukharin called a man of Napoleonic stamp. It is alleged that material concerning Tukhachevsky, forged by the German intelligence service, was given to Benes who passed it on to Stalin. But why do Tukhachevsky's defenders not make clear that he was tried not on the basis of espionage material but because of his participation in the Trotskyist-Bukharinist plot, which used a group of high-ranking officers, headed by Tukhachevsky, as a spearhead by which they hoped to overthrow Stalin's government by force?

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the last Moscow trial, this was described in detail not by members of the German intelligence service but by Bukharin himself. Here are his words:

> Since we are dealing with a handful of military men, it follows that the specific gravity of the military element in the plot will be exceptionally great. . . . This might give rise to a bonapartist danger, and the bonapartists—I had in mind Tukhachevsky among others—will settle accounts with their allies, the so-called instigators, after the Napoleonic model.

Other examples could be quoted. Why do the opportunists, in rehabilitating Tukhachevsky, not mention these facts? In the foreign press, anti-fascist writers recorded with anxiety and amazement that during his visits to Berlin and other capitals Tukhachevsky disparaged the strength of our army and extolled the fascist *Wehrmacht*—an intolerable attitude on the part of the chief of the Red Army general staff. Why do the opportunists who parade their love of justice not recall that the Moscow trials were chiefly aimed at Trotsky, who was abroad, while the execution of Tukhachevsky and his accomplices finally crushed the spirit of the 'Judas of the Russian revolution'?

In the interests of both proletariat and peasantry

We may therefore deduce that the persecutions carried out by the Stalinist dictatorship down to 1934 were directed against the petty-bourgeois opportunists who opposed the building of socialism in our country, collectivisation and industrialisation.

But in Lenin's time—the opportunists would say—the persecutions were on a smaller scale. That is true. But in Lenin's time also, the strife between the proletarian and the counter-revolutionary forces in the country had not yet reached its final phase. The real battle had to be waged against the petty-bourgeois ideologists, on the issue of collectivisation—and in this battle they were beaten by the bolsheviks, led by Stalin. This happened because the Russian peasantry showed itself more revolutionary than its ideologists. This is an important point and we should examine it more closely. The peasant masses of Soviet Russia, who had lived through three revolutions and been taught by experience to put their trust in the bolsheviks, had sensed, on the eve of collectivisation, the tendency to divide them into strata. And although the Russian kulaks were not yet of special importance (a fact which today affords the opportunists a pretext for barren judgments to the effect that no-one in our country could be described as a kulak), the incompatibility between Soviet power and these embryos of a bourgeoisie showed the peasants clearly what they might expect from a development based on private property. This explains why—although collectivisation took place perforce more rapidly than it would have done in more favourable conditions, although some zealous functionaries, contrary to party directives, shortened the time-limits laid down, and although there were even individual cases of action against collectivisation—the bulk of the peasantry joined the kolkhozes and did not heed the appeal of the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries to oppose collectivisation by rebellion. The peasantry came into step with life, with the revolution.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their trained ideologists could not do so, because they were the personification of the theoretical possibilities of the peasant consciousness—they personified the 'weakness' of the working class. Consequently their liquidation was in the interest both of the proletariat and of the peasantry.

The people feel that Stalin belongs to them

Very well—the opportunists will say—since we tried to justify Bukharin, since we propose to erect a monument to Tukhachevsky, we shall not criticise too severely Stalin and the persecutions down to 1934. But what of those committed in 1937? There is nothing in Lenin's works to explain these.

In order to understand correctly the class aspect of the 'persecutions' of 1937, it suffices to ask: which class suffered from them? Certainly not the proletariat. Some highly placed persons of proletarian origin were indeed arrested, but the class itself was unscathed. On the contrary: since the 'persecutions' largely corresponded to factors of social origin, a proletarian origin and position was the best safeguard against them. That is why in those days many people who had belonged to the upper strata of Tsarist Russia went to work in the mines, which as a rule proved their salvation. Does this mean that it was the peasantry which suffered in 1937? Not at all. If certain peasants have unpleasant memories, these relate to 1929 when they were branded as kulaks. Can it be said that the arrests in general were not on a class basis at all, and did not express class interests? This is what the opportunists claim, and they go so far as to ascribe schizophrenia to Stalin in order to explain the persecutions. But clearly such a view only reflects the mental deficiency of those who hold it.

The 'persecutions' of 1937 were, from the social point of view, directed fairly and squarely against the existing bureaucratic apparatus, remnants of the exploiting classes and a section of the intelligentsia. It is clear now why these circles attacked the 'personality cult' so fiercely and why our toiling masses show an attachment to Stalin's memory which amazes the opportunists. These gentry talk of our 'slavish nature', of our people's 'need for tsars' and similar ravings. But, as we have seen, the matter is very simple—it is a question of the people's class instinct. Already previously, this wicked man thought that 'bureaucrats and former bureaucrats ought to be liquidated, and he was now still of the same opinion. Stalin, as we know, achieved this on the basis of sufficiently strong arguments. That is why the people think of him as one of themselves and as their representative.

But were the persecutions really necessary? The opportunists, with their eyes fixed on the internal situation of the country, declare that they were not. In so doing they naively close their eyes to the fact, which they regard as secondary, that fascism in the West was looming like a dark cloud and was openly proclaiming its anti-Soviet intentions. The opportunists, who remember every buffet they received from Stalin, suffer lapses of memory when history is under discussion, and they ignore the fact that in 1936–37 the danger of war was particularly grave. Was it not right to purge the home front once again of all wavering and

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dangerous elements, on the eve of a war in which the imperialists sought to embroil the Soviet Union with nazi Germany? This question was answered by the Vlasovs in Russia, the Banderas in the Ukraine, and the 'punitive detachments' of the Crimea, who had not been shot in 1937!

Are we to believe the opportunists when they say that the wrong people were shot in 1937? They profess especial distress at the liquidation of the 'best part' of the party and state apparatus. . . .

Can one build a society by kid-glove methods?

Be all this as it may, were there victims of the persecutions who did not deserve their fate? We think there may have been; but who was to blame? The major responsibility falls on the bureaucracy itself. It may well be that certain events of 1937 are to be explained by the fact that the bureaucratic apparatus at that time and the fight against bureaucracy and petty-bourgeois tendencies were conducted in too bureaucratic a fashion, and that the petty bourgeoisie destroyed itself by its own denunciations. The gentlemen of the intelligentsia denounced, slandered, settled accounts, bore false witness—and, of course, all this was sometimes at the expense of honest and loyal citizens. And it is insects like these who now insult the great man's memory and parade their sorrow at the flouting of 'humanitarian' principles!

Stalin's attitude towards the excesses which occurred in those days is best shown by the fact that he ordered the execution of the Commissar for Internal Affairs, Yezhov, on the sole ground of bureaucratism during the purges. It must be realised that Stalin had only this bureaucratic apparatus at his disposal and was obliged in practice to work at its level.

But who can dare to accuse the dictatorship of the proletariat of having had its victims? The forty centuries of human history that are known to us tell the tale of how oppressors have killed, despoiled, tortured, and violated the oppressed. For four thousand years they strove consistently to darken the minds of the oppressed by depriving them of possibilities of advance, of the elementary forms of social activity. When the oppressed at last seized power and had to build up their own society in the most unfavourable conditions, subject to a general boycott, without training or experience, without the necessary material resources and under the threat of a devastating war, can they be expected to have achieved their aims without committing any mistakes, and as it were with kid gloves on? Who could think of demanding this except the oppressors themselves, the bourgeoisie which, having suffered defeat and discomfiture, has become a 'champion of humanitarianism and moral purity'? If the Soviet regime is to blame vis-à-vis some of its own worthy sons, then it is not for you gentlemen to range yourselves in their company. They were ready at all times to sacrifice their lives for the sake of the Soviet regime; and if they could hear you today you would be hard put to it to stand up to them!

A model for revolutionaries

Stalinism, defined in general terms, denotes the activities of the dictatorship of the proletariat—the totality of measures adopted by that

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dictatorship in order to build the foundations of socialism in a country of small peasants. The proletariat, confronted by a hostile economic environment which continues to breed capitalism to an ever-increasing extent, is obliged to enforce its dictatorship by all available means and at all costs. The proletariat's struggle against the bourgeois state of mind which was then coming into being for the first time in Russia, was perforce exceptionally violent and accompanied by inevitable mistakes. Without doubt, this painful experience will greatly help the working class in other countries when they have to act in similar circumstances, and will make the process more rational. This experience will also help to avert the situation which has now arisen in the USSR. Owing to the growth of bureaucracy, the centre of revolutionary power has gradually become estranged from the people by a bureaucratic stratum which has divided the nation and prevented it from acting with complete unity. When Stalin created and consolidated the state apparatus, thus achieving a work of great historic importance which ensured our economic success throughout the process of laying the foundations of socialism, he had to use this bureaucratic apparatus; he struggled against it with the aid of this very apparatus, and that is why he was unable to overcome it completely. He saw how bureaucracy grew up even though he relentlessly cut off the heads which it kept sprouting. In his striving for revolutionary purity he did not trust all those around him (only Molotov proved to be his true comrade in arms), and it is hard to say that he was wrong. Stalin's personality is, in truth, historic and sacred. He stands in history as a model revolutionary, a warning to the half-hearted and a terror to enemies.

The domination of the bureaucracy

Stalin's death freed the hands of the bureaucracy. A minority of this body, which had remained faithful to the socialist state and regarded service to it as its sole duty, continued to follow Stalin's line. But the greater part of the bureaucracy, which had long existed for itself alone, saw the possibility of freeing itself from proletarian control in general and from the higher communist leadership, which aimed at restraining the bureaucracy's self-seeking tendencies and eventually replacing it by a broader expression of the people's power. Naturally, the bureaucracy could not, in our country, proclaim its domination openly without receiving an immediate check. In order to maintain its position in the framework of the Soviet state, the bureaucracy had to show that it was following the right course, that it was not only remaining faithful to revolutionary ideals but was more devoted to them than Stalin himself. It had to present its own liberation from Stalin's control as a liberation of the whole people. This, of course, was not easy to achieve—the less so as the working class of the Soviet Union rejected from the outset all the opportunists' fabrications and adopted a completely negative attitude towards them. Moreover, certain party and state leaders (Molotov, Malenkov, etc.) remained loyal to the dictatorship of the proletariat and endeavoured openly to resist the bureaucracy.

The latter, being the material embodiment of the centralisation of power and the drawbacks that this may involve, did its best to lay the blame for these on Stalin and to divert the workers' attention from

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself. But if Stalin were to blame for everything, it would have been logical to make a clean break with the methods of the ' personality cult '. Having no desire to modify their traditional and brutal ways, however, the bureaucrats, while in theory they reject these methods, in practice react with anger and contempt to any steps in the direction of democratisation and the limitation of their power. For the methods of the ' personality cult ' are not Stalin's methods but those of the bureaucracy, which poisoned Soviet life in Stalin's time and which, since his death, has been stifling and persecuting all that is alive, active, and truly Soviet.

In fact, the ' personality cult ', if one comes to look at it, was merely a repetition, probably in its acutest form, of the cult of the bureaucracy, each member of which was a ' personality ' in his own office. The opportunists make the ' personality cult ' an excuse for the bureaucracy, whereas in fact it is nothing other than the consequence of bureaucracy. It was the bureaucrats who degraded the love of the whole people for Stalin by transforming it into a mechanical ritual—and this not without an eye to their own position, since it enabled them to demand similar treatment for themselves. While the bureaucrats exalted Stalin in public, they privately ground their teeth with rage. They hated Stalin because he was the main pillar of the socialist state, built by the toil and sweat of the populace, while they were its offscourings. It is not surprising that the bureaucrats seek to present their grievances against Stalin in humanitarian and democratic terms. In fact, under the cloak of criticising Stalin, the bureaucrats vent all their hatred against the dictatorship of the proletariat which he obliged them to serve.

The class struggle

Can the usurpation of power by the bureaucracy and the struggle against it be considered as a manifestation of the class struggle? The opportunists, as we know, deny altogether that a class struggle exists in the Soviet Union. It is easy to understand that talk of the class struggle, in which they appear as adversaries of the people, does not suit them and is dangerous for them. For this very reason it is worth studying the question carefully in all its aspects.

The bourgeois class policy of the Soviet bureaucracy was clearly shown by the fact that its first step was officially to do away with the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the ostensible ground that it was no longer necessary in the Soviet Union. This in spite of the fact that one half of humanity is still under the capitalist yoke, with the result that, even within the Soviet Union, it is impossible not to feel the consequences of world class conflicts and of bourgeois influences. Instead of the dictatorship and party of the proletariat, the bureaucracy proclaims the state and party of the ' whole people '. But all these terms mean is that the state and party are to be governed by those in authority, namely the bureaucrats, who no longer represent any section of the working people or anyone except themselves. . . .

Listen to the nonsense the bureaucrats talk on the subject of socialist theory. Did dogmatism prevail in Stalin's time? Yes, it did, and we are not afraid to say so. It was the natural and inevitable result of the same state of general ignorance, the period of tutelage while Marxism was being assimilated by the masses. The process of instruction in the use

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a weapon is bound to be a dogmatic one. Only after mastering it can we use it in a free and creative manner. This is the case even as regards dialectical thinking, as anyone can understand who will take the trouble to consider it. The initial dogmatism is there to be surmounted, but that does not mean that we should, like the opportunists, throw Marxism overboard and replace it by bourgeois freedom of thought—thought which is free only because it is empty.

Nonetheless, we cannot say that these people have nothing to do with Marxism. The tragi-comedy of their position is that they cannot maintain it in practice without preaching Marxism in words. They feed their minds on the book which contains their death sentence. Is it strange that they endeavour to distort what they read and to weaken the condemnation they find there? Strong in their ignorance, they do their best to tie Marxism hand and foot and to soften its sharp edges in order to adapt it to their own petty-bourgeois comfort. We have before us a class enemy all the more dangerous because he wears our own uniform—in the heat of the class battle we may mistake him for a friend, trust him, and then be stabbed by him in the back.

For Poland

The Reconstruction of the Polish Communist Party

THE situation in Poland has greatly deteriorated during the last few years. Economic difficulties have multiplied, bureaucracy and opportunism have increased, bribery and theft flourish, and the country is threatened by unemployment.

Instead of the expected improvement in the material conditions of the working class, the reverse has taken place. The struggle for existence has drained the confidence of the people in the system. Workers feel that they are both deceived and exploited, despite claims that they wield power. The worker is not only unable to identify his interests with government policy, but sees at every turn that his position is being undermined and his life is being made more difficult. Both the urban and rural working masses are gradually being deprived of their fundamental rights, won during many years of revolutionary struggle. . . .

Recent price increases have adversely affected the working-class standard of living. The price of basic foodstuffs, such as meat, bread, butter, milk, and fruit, has risen considerably. Many industrial products, such as textiles, furniture, household equipment, etc., have increased in price several times. Electricity costs have doubled and both gas and coal are now more expensive, as are books, school equipment, theatre and cinema tickets. The working population suffered another brutal blow not long ago when rents were radically increased. In addition, relatively high payments for flats, medicine, nurseries, and kindergartens have been introduced.

By a distortion of socialist principles concerning the distribution of national income, bourgeois and parasitical elements have been able to misappropriate this money. Problems connected with grain, which is of decisive importance for raising the standard of living, are becoming

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more acute. The law of value is now operating more freely. Capitalist principles of profitability and profit are superseding the socialist aim of satisfying the needs of the working people. Despite juggling with figures, even official statistics show that this goal, which is an integral part of the socialist programme, is not being realised. . . .

Although incomplete, this picture indicates the results of changes implemented after the introduction of the 'new economic model' which the revisionists claimed would improve the general standard of living. But lies are short-lived.

The beginning of a retreat from socialism took place in the towns after 1956 at a time when the building of a socialist structure in rural areas had been abandoned. Capitalist relationships now prevail in country districts where increasing exploitation of the peasantry by the kulaks is a stark reality. Today, bourgeois speculators and corrupt bureaucrats are more powerful in the towns and have a stronger voice in public affairs.

In effect, this is the peaceful realisation of the second stage of counter-revolution. The failure to build socialism merely breeds capitalism. The abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the failure to pursue a policy of class war can only lead to the rule of the bourgeoisie. This is the road from proletarian dictatorship to dictatorship over the proletariat. Proof of this course can be increasingly seen in Gomulka's speeches, which often contain the notion of a state detached from the working class—a 'state' regarded as an abstract force which allegedly subsidises every citizen but from an unknown source. Poland is no longer a proletarian dictatorship but is gradually becoming a dictatorship of bourgeois elements and venal bureaucracy over the proletariat. Lenin gave warning against this danger.

Poland's state machine receives more and more privileges and the so-called 'able' members of the security forces and militia are much better paid than previously. The apparatus of repression in a socialist state is a political instrument designed to combat the enemies of the system. Deprived of its political attributes, the apparatus is being manipulated by the present leaders as a tool to terrorise communists and the working class. To further this purpose, the loyal party militant is being dismissed and gradually replaced by a new body of well-paid people distinguished from their predecessors by a lack of ideology. These new party men are generously remunerated in secret and receive high distinctions in proportion to the degree of their servile obedience to the revisionists.

A similar situation is apparent in the army, where the main officer corps is impoverished. The rights and privileges of junior officers are being curtailed by various methods. Their allowances are being reduced, opportunities for promotion no longer exist, wives are dismissed from work, and widows of officers are forced to give up their flats. Irrespective of competence, abilities, and political past, promotion is reserved for those who openly declare themselves in favour of the present leadership.

These facts testify both to the break with Marxist-Leninist ideology and to the inglorious advance along the road towards capitulation to imperialism. Revisionist treason is aiming at the gradual disintegration and defamation of the socialist system in order eventually to reintroduce capitalism in Poland.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nobody can deny that in the immediate post-war period, despite the ruins and other difficulties, every year brought new successes in the reconstruction of the country, and the national income was fairly distributed. There were real prospects for a better future and the fruits of the toil of both workers and peasants benefited town and country. The main direction of a policy designed to establish socialism in rural and urban areas was manifestly correct and produced good results. . . .

The new leadership which emerged in 1956 completely reversed the revolutionary line of the party, which was pushed in the direction of passivity and compromise with the forces of reaction. . . . Revisionist leaders exploited all available mass media such as the press, radio, and television in order to delude the working people with assurances that the 'new course' was a great improvement on the pre-1956 party policy. After nine years, however, every working man can feel and see that the activities of Gomulka's right-wing followers and the allied Zionist group, do not serve the interests of the urban and rural workers and working masses. On the contrary, only the bourgeoisie and petit-bourgeois

This map is being distributed in Poland by the pro-Chinese Mijal group, whose 'Programme' is reproduced above. The caption under the map assures its Polish readers that the 'Temporary Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party . . . guarantees such a Poland to you'. The map shows as part of Poland Kaliningrad, Minsk, Kiev, as well as Lvov and Vilno, and other cities now part of the USSR.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elements, kulaks, careerists, bureaucratic dignitaries and thieves, have benefited from the changes introduced by the new government. . . .

Although the productive capacities of factories are not fully exploited, the danger of capitalist unemployment is becoming more real. This is tantamount to a blatant squandering of productive forces and cannot be reconciled with socialism, and for this reason there must be a drive towards full employment and maximum production. Restricted industrial production reduces national income and artificially lowers the standard of living of the working people.

It is true that the efficiency of the methods of production leaves much to be desired. Revisionists attempt to improve the situation by offering material incentives to factory directors and administrators who are ordered to set higher norms and exploit their labour forces while maintaining a low level of wages. This method is reminiscent of the capitalist system described by Frederick Taylor, according to whom the worker is only an addition to the machine. The problem will not be solved in this way. Low productivity is a result of general disorder, disorganised work, defective co-operation, insufficient supply of raw materials, and the irresponsible attitude of the factory management. Many people belonging to the category of management have their roots in alien classes or are hypocrites, careerists, and flatterers. Since 1956 the criterion of ideological attitude has been completely abandoned in the selection of personnel. The qualifications now deemed necessary are so-called competence and diplomas, and posts are given to people coming from a largely bourgeois environment.

It is vital that the national income should be justly distributed. The worker should be confident that the fruits of his labour will be shared by himself and his fellow workers, and not devoured by the bourgeoisie and parasites. Wastage and theft must be eliminated by determined opposition. Honest and healthy competition should be introduced to stimulate socialist production.

The question of remuneration is of paramount importance. There are at present in Poland several systems of payment designed to hide existing inequalities. Not even the average wage, not to mention the lowest, would secure a minimum level of existence. This state of affairs is not acceptable. A man unable to support himself by honest work is a phenomenon wholly inconsistent with a genuine socialist system. It is not correct to state that Poland is unable to afford full employment when theft on a huge scale, the seizure of national income by capitalists in the towns and the countryside and by dignitaries surrounded by wealth, are tolerated. . . .

The main function and duty of the alliance between workers and peasants should be the reorganisation of agriculture on the basis of socialist principles. There is no point in deceiving the peasantry and it is wrong to allow this class to become the victim of a capitalist rural economy. The problem should be seen in its true light. Co-operative farming is synonymous with rural socialism and, given Polish conditions, there is no other viable alternative. With the formation of agricultural 'circles' the peasants were encouraged to believe that they would reap benefits; in practice, the kulaks were thus enabled, with state help, to introduce new forms of exploiting the poorer peasantry. In addition, the kulaks found it easy to manipulate the national income, in the form of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state aid to the 'circles', to their own advantage. Rural socialism will never emerge from such policies. Poland's economic and food structure requires modifications in the organisation of agriculture, which should be remodelled along socialist lines. The deficit of grain, necessitating grain imports from abroad, rose from 1·2 million tons to 4 million tons between 1956 and 1965, and the cost was largely covered by the workers.

Reconstruction of the countryside must be a slow process. There must never be a repetition of the recent administrative distortions and mistakes made by the present revisionists. Rural co-operatives can be organised only on voluntary principles and the first ones should be established in areas likely to be conducive to their healthy development. An intensive propaganda campaign supported by statistics should be conducted to attract the peasantry to co-operative farming. The countryside must be immediately reorganised by degrees, but this process should never pass beyond the bounds of legality. Instead of lining the kulaks' pockets with milliards of zlotys, funds should be used to establish and support efficient and profitable co-operatives which will notably improve living conditions for the peasantry and will therefore act as an incentive for hard honest work.

There is no possibility of maintaining socialism in the towns for any length of time without socialism in the rural areas. This is an objective economic law of social development and it is useless to pretend ignorance of its existence . . .

Spontaneous economic activity in Poland today is clearly growing rapidly. Organised and planned management of production is gradually being replaced by disorganisation and an increasingly spontaneous operation of the law of value.

A free play of forces exists in the Polish market. The present leaders attempt to hide all the consequences of this phenomenon with empty speeches about profitability and with pseudo-scientific economic theories. Gomulka's supporters introduced a new economic model but it proved a failure. Despite all revisionist efforts to conceal the truth, Poland's economy is gradually assuming the attributes of capitalist anarchy. A socialist economy is a planned economy: it possesses necessary reserves and is ensured against temporary market fluctuations. For this reason, it promotes the continual improvement of the standard of living of the working masses and the systematic development of productive forces. It would not have been difficult under a socialist economy to minimise the effects of the 'hardest winter of the century'. Acute winters are not unusual in Poland, but the continuous fluctuations normally described as 'unexpected' and 'catastrophic', and bringing in their wake either a surplus or insufficiency of milk, a good or a bad fruit crop, or an increase or decline in cattle breeding, would not be so disastrous under a planned economy. What has recently been happening in our economy is similar to the spontaneous play of forces on the market in a backward capitalist country. . . .

The influence of bourgeois ideology is particularly dangerous in the spheres of science, culture, and propaganda, where complete confusion reigns. There is no properly directed opposition to the spread of bourgeois ideas. The future intelligentsia and architects of socialism are being trained in institutions of higher education. It is most important that

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

socialism should not be a superficial verbal declaration for them but a directive for their whole lives and a personal, profoundly held conviction.

The attitudes, ideas, and daily habits of the population are moulded by the theatre, cinema, television, fine arts and literature. Are socialist ideals impressed on the minds of our society by such media? Are they able to offer those esthetic values promoting socialist morality and ideological zeal, developing the mind and enriching culture? On the basis of the programmes offered by ideological and cultural institutions, it would be difficult to answer in the affirmative. They draw freely on the worst examples of capitalist culture and these programmes are full of anti-socialist ideas, corrupting brutality, and licentious eroticism. Decadent capitalism is delivered to Polish customers in the form of an attractively-packed western culture. It is little wonder that the working people do not see such plays at the theatre and refuse to read such books, instinctively defending themselves against the imported influx of alien ideological concepts. This 'art' is, however, enthusiastically received by the snobbish petit bourgeoisie, and unfortunately also by the majority of the younger generation corrupted by revisionism and attracted by capitalist 'novelties'. The results of this policy can be seen everywhere. If the flood is not dammed and counteracted by a human culture and high-quality socialist art, the already serious losses will be irreparable for a long time to come.

The problem of Church-State relations has caused much unnecessary ill-feeling both in the past and recently. On the one hand, the reactionary elements among the clergy have exploited religious beliefs in the interests of anti-socialist political activities; on the other, revisionists have ignored and insulted the feelings of believers, and in so doing have artificially fostered religious fanaticism and conflict. After October 1956 revisionist policy can be regarded as a characteristic example of the manipulation of religious sentiments for political purposes. Revisionist leaders tried to kindle unreal passions and divide society into believers and non-believers in order to provoke incidents and then take advantage of the ensuing confusion to promote the struggle against the party, communists, and socialism. Christian beliefs are professed by the majority of Poles. An analysis of the depth of these beliefs will not change the facts.

It should be emphatically stated that religious belief is a matter for the individual conscience. That this is guaranteed by the Constitution is not sufficient—it must also be confirmed in everyday practice. Communists are not interested in conducting an adventurist policy of insulting the feelings of the majority but, equally, they cannot allow the rights and freedom of conscience of non-believers to be infringed. Religion is not the question dividing Polish society. Only one division is recognised by communists—that of class. Politics and religion must be separated. From the very beginning, both believers and non-believers have been active in constructing the foundations of socialism in Poland. No real basis exists for an artificially-created discord over the subject of religion. . . .

On the condition that the Church in Poland abstains from politics, which is not its function, the socialist state, for its part, will guarantee a full understanding of legitimate ecclesiastical needs within the framework

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Church's religious activities. The existing separation of Church and State can and should allow the development of a relationship which is advantageous both for the country and for the people.

National minorities in Poland do not constitute even one per cent of the total population. Basically, the country is ethnically homogeneous, and there are no objective reasons for conflicts of nationalism. On the contrary, everything favours harmonious coexistence, especially since communists oppose discrimination on national and racial grounds. As Marxists, we advocate equal rights for all nationalities. But this does not mean that particular privileges should be given to any national minority. Even less can we tolerate the appearance in Poland of a Zionist, Trotskyite, group of Jewish nationalists who use the concept of equal rights as a cover for their aspiration to establish Jewish domination over thirty million Poles. This group, composed of Jewish bourgeois and petit-bourgeois elements, is imperialism's most reliable agency in Poland. It enjoys the support not only of Israel but also of American imperialism and Radio Free Europe. The Poznan riots of 1956 and the October counter-revolution were started and organised by these people, who concluded an alliance with the right-wing nationalist deviationists led by Gomulka.

The class aspect of the problem should not be overlooked. It must be stated that the overwhelming majority of the Jewish proletariat was brutally murdered by the nazis. A large number of the rich Jewish bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie who escaped with their lives, illicitly enjoyed a certain type of class immunity, having assumed the communist traditions of the Jewish proletariat. Years of experience have shown that most traitors and enemy agents belong to this group, which believes that the homeland is wherever power is accompanied by profits and privileges. . . . Jewish nationalists regarded the building of socialism as a great business enterprise and were able to make profits at the expense of the workers. Extremely hostile to the working class, Zionists were the main source of slanders against all the achievements of socialism. 'Party members' who were Zionists in disguise, organised the October plot in 1956 together with Zambrowski and Gomulka, and then fled to Israel and to the West.

The activities of the Zionist agency in the party leadership and government offices have caused and are still causing great harm to our economy and culture. By means of national solidarity and mutual help, the Jewish nationalists have succeeded in gaining control over scientific, cultural, literary, and artistic circles, and have also successfully penetrated the departments controlling economic policy and both party and state hierarchies. Jews have poisoned the culture of the Polish nation with their destructive and alien ideas. The Polish intelligentsia has been subdued and pushed aside by the Zionists. It is necessary to eliminate all traces of Jewish influence so that the talents of the Polish intellectuals, whose great humanist traditions are renowned throughout the world, can develop without hindrance. They would then be in a position to find and establish a common language with the Polish workers and place their abilities at the service of the working masses of our country.

Deprived of real information, Polish society is aware of only a few of these facts because almost the entire machinery of propaganda is in the hands of the Zionist mafia. Poles are not aware that the Jewish agency

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of imperialism is responsible for the main distortions and errors which have occurred in the past. It is not sufficient to break this conspiracy of silence. A determined war must be waged and concluded against the Zionist agency in Poland.

One should not yield to the blackmail which claims that opposition to Jewish nationalists is tantamount to anti-semitism. Such blackmail only serves to disguise and protect the privileged position of the Zionists. Communists will always strongly oppose real anti-semitism, which is a product of the capitalist world. The final defeat of this foreign agency in our country will not serve to weaken but to promote the communist fight against anti-semitism.

Ten years ago the Zionist and Trotskyite 'Pulawska' faction openly betrayed socialism. Polish and Jewish nationalists took over the leadership of the party and state. With Zambrowski's approval and the support of Polish reactionary forces, Wladyslaw Gomulka and his adherents stand at the head of the so-called 'new' leadership. . . . The confused and disorientated masses supported Gomulka in the same way that certain sections of the working class gave their approval to Pilsudski in May 1926—and there has been a similar disillusionment. The whole process of building socialism in Poland was endangered. Gomulka followed in Tito's footsteps and the first stages of the bourgeoisie's dreams were thus fulfilled.

During the last ten years, the so-called new leadership of the Polish United Workers' Party has removed the majority of communists from its executive bodies. . . . At the same time people from an alien class and ideological background have been admitted into the party, in which petit-bourgeois elements are now predominant. . . . Tens of thousands of long-standing active party members, hardened in the ideological struggle, have been expelled from its ranks, while careerists and opportunists, indifferent to political issues, have been introduced in unlimited numbers. The Polish United Workers' Party is today a workers' party only in name. In reality, it has been transformed into a bourgeois organisation and stripped bare of revolutionary ideology. Deprived of an organisational bond, dispersed communists no longer have a Marxist-Leninist party. . . . Democracy has completely disappeared from the Polish United Workers' Party and democratic centralism has been replaced by bureaucratic centralisation. . . . The party has lost all its Leninist features. Criticism and self-criticism have ceased at all levels, from local organisations up to the central committee. Elections within the party are a complete fiction and a system of appointments is used in all the party organs. With the revisionist usurpation of the leadership, control over the 'loyalty' of party members is being exercised by security forces who direct their activities against the communists and the working classes, heedless of the price to be paid. On Gomulka's orders, ideological 'discussions' now take place between interrogators and arrested communists in prison interrogation cells.

The myth of freedom introduced by the so-called 'Polish October' has finally ended up in this cesspool. Careerism, demoralisation, and corruption are spreading in the ranks of the party. High-ranking members are involved in numerous rackets while the party is rotting away. The present revisionist leadership is methodically executing its plans to destroy the communist party in Poland.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The establishment of a new communist party—a party of the workers—is an urgent task. Communists must organise themselves for the fight in defence of socialism against revisionism. The realisation of the second stage of the counter-revolution must be prevented; there must be no bourgeois seizure of power and no restoration of capitalism.

Cadres must be a fundamental feature of the new communist party, which must draw in the most devoted and experienced revolutionary leaders. The new party must be a secret movement in order to escape destruction by the revisionists. Only under these conditions will it emerge victorious from the conflict.

Secret centres of this Communist Party of Poland already exist in many provinces. Its local bodies are called *revolutionary groups*, and these are being set up in the larger industrial plants, in state, economic, social, scientific, and other institutions. There are communists everywhere and a network of revolutionary cells must cover the whole country.

The Communist Party of Poland is assuming the leadership of the fight in defence of the interests of both workers and socialism against revisionism.

The programme calling for the building of socialism in Poland has not been carried out. From the very beginning it has been sabotaged by revisionists and Trotskyites. After the 'October revolution', Gomulka's group threw overboard the project of building socialism, and chose a retrograde course leading to capitalism. The Communist Party of Poland has retrieved and proudly carries the banner of Socialist Poland in the name of victory, socialism, communism, and the well-being of the working people of our country.

THE WORLD TODAY

The monthly journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs provides the general reader with up-to-date and authoritative information on current world problems.

Recent numbers include articles on:

Unemployment in Developing Countries	*Sir Arthur Lewis*
The Changing Scene in Germany	*Fritz René Allemann*
Crisis in Jordan	*Eric Rouleau*
International Law, Rhodesia, and the U.N.	*Rosalyn Higgins*
Cuban Dilemmas	*Raymond Carr*

Annual Subscription: 35s. (U.S.A. and Canada $5.30). 3s. per issue

Orders may be sent to booksellers and newsagents, or to the Oxford University Press, Press Road, Neasden, London, N.W.10.

177

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PERSONALITY CULT

We reproduce below two recent documents reflecting the continuous struggle about Stalin's role in Soviet history. One of them is a shortened version of a discussion on the proposed text of the third volume of the new History of the CPSU. *It took place at a closed meeting held at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism between some old Bolsheviks and Party historians. The other document is a verbatim report of a similar discussion held there about the book by the historian A. M. Nekrich,* 22 June 1941, *published in the spring of 1965, of which the relevant passages are also reproduced below to give the background of the discussion.*

It is clear that the question of the historical interpretation of Stalin remains a most sensitive one both in the Sino-Soviet dispute and inside the Soviet Union. Although the suggestion that the twenty-third party congress would produce a partial rehabilitation of Stalin was not borne out, references to Stalin in the Soviet press have since become more favourable. The reappraisal is limited to his role in the war: other aspects are played down. On the twenty-fifth anniversary of the German attack on the Soviet Union, Marshal Grechko wrote in New Times *that Stalin had ignored warnings of the impending German attack and had been wrong in his assessment of the political-military situation. But the anniversary of the defence of Moscow provided an opportunity to mention Stalin favourably. Marshal Zhukov in* Sovetskaya Moldaviya *(20 October 1966) said that he 'did a colossal job in organising the necessary strategic reserves and . . . achieved, one might say, the near-impossible'. Marshal Rokossovsky in* Moskovskaya Pravda *(18 October 1966) paid a tribute to Stalin as an inspiring leader who was able to encourage military commanders in a difficult situation 'with a few words'. Marshal Budenny* (Izvestiya, *6 November 1966), described the 7 November 1941 military parade in Red Square before Stalin as a 'turning point in the psychological attitude of the masses'.*

Other favourable comments appeared in Pravda *(5 November 1966),* Komsomolskaya Pravda *(6 November 1966), and* Economic Gazette *(no. 44). Brezhnev in his speech at Tbilisi on 1 November 1966 named Stalin among Georgian 'ardent revolutionaries' and this, according to* Pravda, *received prolonged applause.*

Such remarks, although relatively mild as rehabilitation, stand in striking contrast with the tone of the book by Nekrich and of the two discussions reproduced below.

Discussion of the draft third volume of The History of the CPSU

Present: 250.

Presidium of the conference: Academician P. N. Pospelov, member

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of CPSU since 1896; F. N. Petrov; Academician I. I. Mints; D. M. Kukin, vice-chairman of IML editorial board; Glebov and others, representing the ideological section of the CC of the party.

Pospelov (IML): More than 1,000 comrades have taken part in the discussion of the manuscript and draft of the third volume. The authors were guided by the documents of the founders of Marxism-Leninism and by material already published and in the archives. There were many difficulties, as layers of subjectivist judgments which had been included in earlier decades, including the last few years, had to be stripped off. We must tell the truth about this . . .

Fofanova, M. B. . . . From the middle 30s onwards the influence of Stalin's cult of personality made itself felt, particularly in 1938. The *Short Course* played a major role in the distortion of party history. In the *Short Course* Stalin overshadowed the party, the people, and Lenin. His influence was felt in many books on the history of the party, making them unreadable. In the third volume of the present *History* I am mentioned. I am supposed to have said that Lenin arrived in Petersburg at the end of September. I said nothing of the kind. There are documents proving that Lenin returned before the CC decision. Here are two shorthand records of mine and comrade Rakhya's examination on the eve of 1934 (reads). Here are N. K. Krupskaya's memoirs (reads). Why is this material not used by the editors? I and comrade Rakhya were questioned for the party history, but on 1 December 1934 Sergei Mironovich Kirov was killed, and you know what became of the history of the party and of the party itself . . .

Borisov (old Bolshevik): Comrades! The editors avoid the awkward question of Stalin's and Kamenev's position during the preparations for October. Together with Bolshevik delegates I visited Stalin after the February revolution. We asked: 'Why is the question of the Soviets' seizing power not being considered?' Stalin replied: 'The Provisional Government is not all that weak; it is about the same as the Soviets'. That was his statement.

At the time we did not know Lenin's position. We missed Lenin, we missed his letters in which he talked about the party's tasks. The party was not told about Lenin's letters. That was the fault of Kamenev and Stalin. They were in charge of the All-Russian March conference. We did not hear a word from them about Lenin's letters and his position, although they knew. And later, Stalin had the impertinence to say that he and the party both made a mistake. Lenin characterised Stalin's desire for unification as treason to socialism. How is it possible not to write about this? . . .

Romanovsky (old Bolshevik): NEP should be defined as Lenin defined it at the tenth party congress. It must be noted that the sixth congress rejected Stalin's proposal, when the current situation was being discussed, that Lenin should appear before the court. It should be shown that Stalin spoke at the congress in favour of Lenin's appearance before the court on condition that the Provisional Government gave

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a safe conduct. And at that time they would have offered every kind of guarantee, but Lenin would have been physically liquidated. . . .

Chairman: Comrades: As there is a meeting of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences today, to confirm the appointment of corresponding members of the Academy, comrades Pospelov and Mints have gone there. They will take part in our meeting tomorrow.

Oslikovskaya (old Bolshevik): . . . The more I study the question of collectivisation, the more I am convinced that Stalin put Trotsky's ideas into practice. He became more of a Trotskyite than Lev Davydovich himself.

Comrade Pospelov named organisations and people from whom he received comments on the third volume of the *History*, but he did not say to what extent these comments were used. What will happen about our statements here? Are our observations and suggestions made merely for later editions and not for this one? Why is our criticism not heeded?

Dinitas (old Bolshevik): We are all interested in making the *History* objective. The fourth and fifth chapters are not bad. One cannot say the same about the earlier chapters. The editors write that the party was faced with difficult tasks after it emerged from underground, but they do not say what these tasks were. Documents can be read in different ways. Borisov's speech was very good. It is necessary to consider his remarks on the March conference and on Stalin's position. The fact that Stalin did not publish Lenin's letters must not be passed over in silence. He only published one, and that belatedly. It is necessary to say this. Future generations will learn from our *History*. Stalin is not the only guilty one. Much should be disclosed. . . . References should be made to sources. . . . The distribution of forces on the eve of October is wrongly presented. It should be shown who were the *mezhraiontsy*—Manuilsky, Uritsky, Lozovsky. Trotsky was at the head of them. They left their mark on the revolution. This must be mentioned.

Milonov (old Bolshevik): . . . About Stalin's speech on Lenin's fiftieth birthday: Stalin said that he had corrected his mistakes. But look at the original source. Stalin said one thing, while during the personality cult period his speech on Lenin's anniversary looked different.

About the date of the rising: there are some lapses into Stalinism: the 24th is too early, the 26th is too late. This is not Lenin's point of view, but Trotsky's, which Stalin shared. (Voices from the hall 'Exactly', 'That's right.') This unfortunately also crept into Khrushchev's speech, slipped in by some adviser who was ignorant of the facts. It also got into the letter about differences with the Chinese Communist Party.

On 6 November 1918 Stalin published an article in *Pravda* maintaining that Trotsky, Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet, participated directly in all the work connected with the leadership of the rising. Stalin maintained that the party owed its victory in October first and foremost

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Trotsky. Strange as it is, this article was reprinted in the collection *October Revolution,* published in 1932. . . .

Volfson (old Bolshevik): . . . Lenin said that the listeners should be told the whole truth. We sinned in teaching party history from the *Short Course.* How is it possible to maintain now that it was useful! The authors write that Stalin was the head of the Revolutionary Military Council (RVS) of the southern front. They maintain that the RVS put a quick end to the actions of traitors. But we know that Lenin sharply criticised Stalin and Voroshilov for their erroneous attitude towards military experts. At the eighth party congress, Stalin's position is presented as correct. This is wrong, Stalin objected to the criticism of the Tenth Army command. That means he was practically in agreement with the military opposition. Together he and Voroshilov liquidated many military experts loyal to the Soviet regime. It was for this that Lenin criticised them at the eighth congress. Why should Stalin be whitewashed? This gives rise to Stalinism and it is very difficult to fight with this weapon against our ideological opponents. It is not our weapon.

On page 218 the mistaken position of Bukharin and Pyatakov on the nationalities question and on the right of workers to self-determination is mentioned. However, only Pyatakov is criticised. If Bukharin was wrong, he should be criticised too. But there is silence on this. Why? Because at the eighth congress Bukharin stated that on the question of workers' self-determination he was following Stalin's statement to the Third Soviet Congress.

This is an anti-Leninist assertion, since Stalin's mistakes should not be covered over; his anti-Leninist assertions, his anti-Leninist position, must be mentioned.

I have taught in universities for a long time. Stalin and his nearest comrades-in-arms Mekhlis and Ezhov did everything possible in order that our party should be portrayed in history as a party of 'spies' and 'enemies of the people'. Young people often ask me: 'How could Lenin find himself surrounded with "enemies" and "traitors"? Who supported him and why?' The twentieth and twenty-second party congresses rehabilitated many names.

Stalin made Lenin's nearest comrades-in-arms into so-called spies and saboteurs.

The authors of the draft have no single point of view, they swing from side to side. They follow the methods of the *Short Course.* The editors print portraits of outstanding party activists, leaders of the Central Committee (Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Rykov), while in the text they only talk about their mistakes, and nothing is said about their positive role.

This must end, so that history can become truly scientific.

Rashal (old Bolshevik): Principles have not been sufficiently clarified in this work. We must remember that it is to appear for the fiftieth

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anniversary of October. We expect a precise and truthful description. Views about the past are still influenced by temporary factors. This can also be seen in the six-volume *History*. How is it possible to praise the *Short Course* in a new textbook? Overcoming the consequences of the personality cult is a directive of the party, but how is this directive embodied in the draft? Peter Nikolaevich Pospelov trusted the authors, while they treated history from the position of the *Short Course*. They maintain that the *Short Course* played a huge part in propaganda, the propaganda of Leninism. This is a mockery of Lenin's words! I went specially to see Sergei Pavlovich Trapeznikov about this. On 14 April last, the head of the science department of the Central Committee saw me and stated that he does not share the assessment of the *Short Course* made by the editors of the volume and promised to give relevant instructions. . . .

(The meeting lasted from 10 to 18.30 hours with an hour's break.)

Second Day

Same members of the Presidium (with the exception of Academician Mints).

Sedugina (old Bolshevik): Party history must be written vividly and convincingly. This is not yet the case. There is no vivid interesting material. The writer must be convinced of his rightness if he is to be able to convey it to the people. Stalin's cult was very harmful for the party and its history. Many facts and events were distorted. None of the congresses suffered such distortion as the sixth. There is no stenographic record, while as regards minutes the same questions are interpreted in different ways. How are they being used? Persistent attempts are made to show that Stalin led the congress. That even after the sixth congress Stalin alone prepared the revolution. Thirty years of Stalin's dictatorship, and later of its consequences, could not pass without a trace. This found its reflection in the *Short Course* which is again being popularised by the present authors. When I looked at the composition of the sixth congress, I found that of 28 members 17 had been subject to repression and the activity of these comrades was distorted in the *History*. The activity of such Bolsheviks as Bukharin and Bubnov was effaced and distorted. Repressions with regard to them cannot be justified. Slandering them in the six-volume edition does not add to its prestige. . . .

Look what is written in the draft—that at the sixth congress a Central Committee was elected—a general staff to lead the insurrection. It is said that it was a militant and united general staff. Now look through the minutes of the congress, see who were the members of this general staff. In Stalin's time almost all of them were numbered among spies and traitors. How did these spies and traitors manage to lead the Great October Socialist Revolution? How could they lead a country which stood up to the whole capitalist world? To write of seventeen people as spies and traitors means defaming the Communist Party.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The congress Manifesto was written by Bukharin. It has a number of virtues, why keep silent about it? . . .

Zorin (old Bolshevik): The draft shows only too clearly the birth-marks of the *Short Course*. The authors themselves do not deny this. They write a paragraph to the effect that the *Short Course* played a big part in the propaganda of party studies. Its removal is not a cosmetic operation. . . . Is the third volume a scientific work or a compilation? The conceptions of the *Short Course* slip in not only in the introduction. And then we will write that our history is being falsified abroad, while we do the same. Where are our articles against our own falsifiers? Why are we afraid of the truth?

It is shameful that yesterday young historians were not allowed in. If you sit by yourselves on top of enormous material, so much the worse for the material. Who will write history after you? To sit on top of historical material like a cur on a stack of hay, to keep Lenin's documents under lock and key—these are crimes indeed. Not one of Lenin's documents can be published without your permission, nothing can be written about Lenin. What does the approval of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism mean? We can neither write nor publish, while bourgeois falsifiers attack.

The draft should show the Leninist norms of party life and how they were distorted by Stalin. This would be both scientific and right, while you keep to a straight line saying that internal party discipline existed all the time. But what then did the twentieth and twenty-second congresses say? We must return to retrieve what was lost.

Your conception is that of the Chinese leaders. You are on the same side as the bourgeois falsifiers. Party history should not justify distortions. You write that Trotsky tried to substitute Trotskyism for Leninism, while you remain silent on Stalin's substitution of Stalinism for Leninism. Do you think young people will believe you? Can young people believe a lie? . . .

Snegov (old Bolshevik): Comrades! First of all I should like to thank the CC in the name of the old Bolsheviks. After the letter of the 34 Old Bolsheviks to the four secretaries of the CC and to Comrade Brezhnev, a meeting with the participation of Old Bolsheviks to discuss the third volume of the party *History* has finally come about. . . . The conception of the third volume is such that it willy-nilly breeds scepticism in young people. Young people are not sceptical because they have not been told the truth, they are sceptical because they have not been told all the truth.

It is said that one man cannot change as much as a whole army can. Stalin proved that it is possible to destroy more than a whole army, he destroyed millions. . . .

Let tender mamas protect baby Stalin by all means. Why, he certainly did not commit any mistakes in October. The 'boy' himself confessed in 1925 that he made mistakes. Confessed! But how? He maintained that he shared these mistakes with the majority of the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party. Does this mean that the majority of the party was with Stalin and not with Lenin?

Lenin said that listeners should be told all the truth. He taught us that party history should be approached in a particularly truthful spirit. Lenin raised the question of expelling Zinoviev and Kamenev from the party before October. But three years later Lenin, as a historian, appraised their position and wrote that Kamenev and Zinoviev erred because they feared isolation. Stalin said definitely that a union with Mensheviks was necessary. Lenin said that he would rather remain alone than join the Mensheviks. However, the careful 'mama' continues to keep silent on this position of Stalin.

Chairman: Your time is up. (Voices, 'extend it', 'let him speak'.)

Snegov: I need another forty minutes.

Chairman: Everybody else had twenty minutes and you want forty more?

(Voices, 'give him forty minutes', 'extend it'.)

Chairman: I put it to the vote. Who is for giving another forty minutes? A majority. Who is against? Two.

Snegov: When Steklov exposed the Provisional Government during the March Conference, Kamenev and Skrypnik declared that there was no question of supporting the Provisional Government. While Stalin declared that he did not agree with them on this. Stalin showed his typical subjectivism. Lenin finished his speech at the Finland railway station with the appeal: 'Long live the Socialist Revolution.' But *Pravda* did not print this.

There are three volumes of party history by Shlyapnikov. He wrote that Stalin, Kamenev, and Muranov, returning from Siberia, welcomed Lvov and the others. . . .

On the question of the Brest peace. The authors of the draft maintain that the Trotskyite-Bukharinite group spoke against it. Is this the case? Were not Frunze, Dzerzhinsky, and Kuibyshev also against the Brest peace? What was Stalin's position? The authors of the draft write that the Trotskyites and Bukharinites tried to wreck the signing of the Brest peace. Lenin told them, if we do not sign it, we will sign the death warrant of the Soviet regime within three weeks. Is this the case? Let us look at the CC minutes. Here it is written: 'Stalin is wrong when he says that it is possible not to sign. If we do not sign, we shall sign a death warrant for the Soviet regime in the course of three weeks.' This is Lenin speaking. How can one falsify documents to such an extent? . . .

The fact is that some people expected the twenty-third congress to rehabilitate Stalin. Nothing has come of it and nothing will! History will not forgive the torture of revolutionaries, of Leninists, which took place in Stalin's prisons. The *Short Course* is the result of these tortures.

The twenty-third congress again confirmed the line of the twentieth and twenty-second congresses. There is no return to Stalin's times. (Prolonged applause.)

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shagaev: I have always worked in the party in a junior job. My speech may be at a low level and perhaps this may cause some anxiety. The aim of the draft is to give an objective assessment of party history. However, this has not been done. Everything was concentrated on Stalin's personality cult, the total condemnation of Stalin. This was done by many who spoke here. You slandered Stalin maliciously (indignant outcries 'toady', 'scoundrel', 'get down', 'he guarded Stalin and he's still a swine'. The Chairman pacifies the meeting and reminds them that they must give everybody a chance to speak for twenty minutes). Stalin led the country properly. Lenin was in favour of Stalin becoming General Secretary. (Indignation throughout the hall. Shouts of 'lies!', 'slander!' The Chairman restores quiet with difficulty.) Here is what I wrote when Khrushchev was in power: 'Stalin was the most firm and consistent Marxist. You, Khrushchev, have wrongly called him an apostate. You would probably call Lenin's letter to the congress a testament, a political testament. Collective leadership was impossible with Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin, and other Trotskyites and Bukharinites. Bukharin dragged us towards capitalism, crying "Enrich yourselves".' (Explosion of indignation in the hall. Cries: 'Lenin carried out collective leadership with them!' 'Stalin got rich by stealing all the credit due to the party and to Lenin!' The Chairman again calls for quiet in the hall.) Stalin managed by skilful manoeuvres to get rid of Trotskyites and Bukharinites. That was right. It was they who, by their anti-party activity, made Stalin even more angry, and he destroyed many innocent men. You cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs. There is nothing strange about this; we only gained from it. Stalin was an inflexible Marxist. . . . He guarded Lenin, but it turned out the other way round. (Indignation throughout the hall. Cries: 'Madman, come to your senses!' 'Scoundrel'. The Chairman again restores quiet in the hall.) Stalin was faithful to Marxism to the end of his life. Stalin was a remarkable genius. He carried out collectivisation, industrialisation, the defence potential of the country was brought to a high level. (Indignation continues in the hall.)

Chairman: Shagaev, your time is up.

(Shagaev asks for an extension. A vote is taken. Unanimous vote that the right to speak be withdrawn.)

One hour's break

In the interval the son of Antonov-Ovseyenko appears—Anton Vladimirovich Antonov-Ovseyenko. Old Bolsheviks approach him. Anton Vladimirovich says: 'You're wasting your time; nothing will be altered in the third volume, unless it is for the worse. I haven't the strength left to fight. I would like to suggest that the third volume

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the History be replaced by a new edition of John Reed's *Ten days that shook the World.*' A lively debate is carried on in the corridor. Old Bolsheviks are indignant because young historians were not admitted to the meeting. One of them says: 'To send back the son of Ion Emmanuilovich Yakir! He is a historian; how can they act like this? Put sentries on guard! From whom do they want to hide the truth? From the children of those who gave their lives for the happiness of the people, who went into battle under Lenin's banner!'

After the break the suggestion is made that the conference be finished that day. The procedure is changed, reducing the twenty minutes for each speaker to ten. . . .

Shutskeper (old Bolshevik): Shagaev's speech fills me with indignation. It does not correspond to the line of the twentieth and twenty-second congresses. After Stalin's letter to the editors of *Proletarskaya Revoliutsiya* and his destruction of party scientific personnel, conditions for the writing of a truthful history were absent. How is it possible to write that the *Short Course* had a positive influence! One lyrical 'detail'. In 1937, on 21 January, the anniversary of Lenin's death, my twelve-year-old son asked a question at school: 'Did Lenin have any comrades-in-arms besides Stalin?' For this I was expelled from the party. The six-volume edition should be a step forward. It should not propagate the ideas of the *Short Course.* . . .

Rusakov (old Bolshevik): When shall we abandon the description 'and others'? How is it possible to write about the 26 Baku Commissars and name only ten, and then write 'and others'? I ask the editors kindly to name all 26 Baku Commissars. . . .

Petrovsky (a young historian): I have spoken to old Bolsheviks several times and said, your ranks are getting thin, you are leaving us while all you say remains within four walls, and the protocols of your conferences will not become the property of historians for a long time. You say that the history of the party will be written by young communists when you are gone. I would like to say that they already write it and write it well. I started with this subject as I should like to relate a disgraceful fact which happened yesterday when many of my comrades—young historians—were sent home. They were not allowed in here. I was not allowed either, in spite of the requests of old Bolsheviks. With great difficulty I obtained official permission to attend the present conference. And what's more, when permission was obtained, the representative of the editors said to the person who gave the official permission: 'Mind, you'll answer for all the consequences!'

Pospelov (Chairman of the editorial board): Who could have said that? It is impossible that it could have been a representative of the editors!

Petrovsky: The comrade who said that and who did not allow me and other young historians into the building is sitting in the hall.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pospelov: Give the name.

Petrovsky: There is the comrade (pointing). Her name is, I think, Gorbunova. She can confirm that that is what happened. (Gorbunova rises blushing: 'Yes, that is how it was') . . .

Bugaev (leader of the commission): We tried to polish the history of the CPSU from the ideological-theoretical aspect. The team of authors shares the anxiety of the old Bolsheviks. We are morally and politically responsible to the party for the contents of the volume. A series of commissions of the editors-in-chief and of the CC worked on the draft. The reproaches to the editors by comrades Roshal, Fofanova, Snegov, and Zorin and their accusations, that we describe the history of the party from the cult position, are wrong. We have been accused of distorting events. That is incorrect. We accept concrete comments. We shall try to correct all faults. We have received 120 comments from scientific collectives and individuals. They have given their opinion as to what should be improved and altered. In fact, we spent two days discussing the problem of one person. We are not writing a multi-volume biography of Stalin. (Noise in the hall. Shouts: 'Don't blacken party history by putting him side by side with Lenin.' 'How can you talk about it?') We must follow the resolution of the CC of 30 July on the personality cult. (Noises in the hall. Shouts: 'The twenty-second congress declared him a criminal!', 'We have no right to forget that Stalin's body was taken out of the Lenin mausoleum for mass crimes!' 'The resolution of the twenty-second congress has not been repealed!') In a multi-volume history Stalin's merits and faults must both be shown. Comrade Shutskeper told of her expulsion from the party in 1937, while the *Short Course* was published in 1938. (Shutskeper, from her seat: 'What has that got to do with it? I spoke of teaching in schools and its distortions before the appearance of the *Short Course*.') All remarks must be checked.

Pospelov: The general evaluation of our work has been positive. Every discussion will, no doubt, be of help in putting the finishing touches to the third volume. The remarks made must be checked and compared with documents. . . . Fundamentally, Stalin defended Leninist positions during the October period. It was he and nobody else who retorted to Preobrazhensky that the possibility was not excluded that Russia would be the first pioneer of socialism. I can declare this officially and it will be mentioned without fail in the seventh volume of the history of the USSR. Irresponsible remarks have often been made here to which the leaders of fraternal parties took exception. Some were subjective remarks. This is a one-sided approach. Recently we were in an office where a young man said that Yaroslavsky had sold himself to Stalin cheaply. (Voice from the hall, 'He spoke the truth'.) Comrades, those who knew Yaroslavsky, can they say this about him? How can one say this about Yaroslavsky? When I started to contradict the young

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people, they told me: 'Comrade Pospelov, you have one advantage. You knew Yaroslavsky and we did not', and they added that consequently they can judge objectively. Yaroslavsky cannot be portrayed as a sort of lickspittle. There was an editorial commission of the CC for the *Short Course*. The book was discussed seven times at meetings of the CC. Stalin had some merits in the struggle against Trotskyism, we must mention this. Comrade Zorin's accusation that the Institute is concealing some sort of documents is wrong. Documents can be published only with the CC's permission. The diaries of Lenin's duty secretaries were also published with the permission of the CC. If we do not publish something, it means that the shorthand record has not been corrected. We must note Stalin's services, mistakes, and crimes. Permit me to thank you for taking part in the discussion of the third volume of the *History of the CPSU*.

Romal (three minutes on a point of information): I did not make the observations to the editors which Comrade Bugaev accuses me of making. I am sincerely convinced that P. N. Pospelov places too much reliance on the editorial board. I have protested and I will continue to protest against the popularisation of the *Short Course*. I do not understand why Comrade Pospelov and others favour this. But I repeat again that I had a talk with the head of the CC science department, Comrade Trapeznikov, who declared that he will give relevant instructions to the editorial board to delete the wording which praises the *Short Course*. Comrade Trapeznikov was in full agreement with this protest. Why have no measures yet been taken to delete from the draft this shameful wording?

Shagaev (three minutes on a point of information): I have been accused of speaking against the decisions of the twentieth and twenty-second congresses (Noise in the hall. Shouts: 'Quiet', 'Stop babbling'.) All of you who speak against Stalin are in the same company as Trotskyites. I have been in the party for sixty years and I have defended Stalin and will continue to defend him. (Indignation in the hall: shouts: 'Get down'.)

Chairman: Comrade Shagaev, this is not a point of information, you are out of order.

Shagaev: I maintain that they are all Trotskyites. Whoever is against Stalin is a Trotskyite. (Noise throughout the hall.) I will finish reading my letter to Khrushchev against attacks on Stalin. (Shouts of indignation. Shagaev is not allowed to speak. The chairman asks him to leave the platform. Raising his fists Shagaev leaves the platform.)

Neizvestny (old Bolshevik): (three minutes on a point of information): Comrades, I suggest that a commission be formed to assist in writing the history of the party.

Chairman: Comrades: We are not empowered to form any kind of commissions. We shall not form any commissions.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Extracts from the book by A. M. Nekrich, 22 June 1941

WHILE acknowledging I. V. Stalin's positive role in leading the country and the armed forces during the Great Patriotic War, it is necessary to point out that the personality cult gave rise to serious mistakes in dealing with some political and strategic problems on the eve of the war and in the course of military action against Hitlerite Germany. Stalin's merit, ' the importance of his actions and pronouncements, was exaggerated under the influence of the personality cult, while the importance of the actions of the party's central committee as a whole was minimised '.

The national economy of the Soviet state could have developed more rapidly and could have reached an even higher level by the time war broke out, had it not been for the negative influence of the personality cult and the unjustified repressions connected with it, which Stalin put into effect against party and Soviet personnel. . . .

The repressions undertaken on Stalin's orders threw the country into a fever. They hindered the development of production, engendered fear and uncertainty, and paralysed initiative. Managers of enterprises were constantly replaced. New people who became leaders of the national economy often had not the necessary experience and knowledge. The atmosphere of spy-mania, artificially created by Stalin, increased mistrust and opened a wide field of action to the ambitious, the lick-spittles, to people without principles, to the self-seekers and slanderers. In these circumstances it required courage to take responsibility for any industrial innovation, particularly if its advantages were not immediately obvious but would appear only after a certain lapse of time. That is why some enterprise managers kept away from innovations and preferred to live ' quietly and humbly ' in order to avoid the risk of being accused of wrecking.

All this, in addition to various economic reasons, was bound to have a negative effect on the development of the national economy, particularly in the field of ferrous metallurgy. Production dropped, or marked time, after 1938. In 1938 14,652,000 tons of cast iron was produced; by 1939 production had dropped by 132,000 tons. Production of steel over the same period fell by 493,000 tons, of rolled products by 529,000 tons. . . .

Soviet military doctrine started from the assumption that any new world war which might break out would be long and protracted. In this war, a coalition of imperialist states might come out against the Soviet Union. The war would make large demands on all state resources: economic, political, and material. It was assumed that the war would be fought on the territory of the opponent, that it would be a war of extermination, and that victory would be achieved with little bloodshed. Although correct in general, these assumptions suffered from some important flaws. The possibility of the war being fought on our own territory was excluded and it was mistakenly assumed that losses would be light. These flaws were aggravated by the mistaken political assumption that the workers of capitalist

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries would unquestionably support the Red Army by force of arms.

These incorrect opinions were widely disseminated both in the army and among the people. They were also propagated in the works of some writers. For instance, the book by N. Shpanov, *The First Blow*, was published before the war and soon sold out. According to this book, by the second day of the war revolts had broken out in Germany against the Hitler regime. . . .

The check on theory provided by war battle practice also showed that some problems were incorrectly solved and that even correct assumptions could not always be realised in practice. Some of these errors by the Soviet military experts, together with the basic cause, an insufficient preparation for repulsing aggression, explain the tragic fact that the tactical unexpectedness of invasion and the initial successes of the fascist army were made possible. . . .

The repressions which Stalin applied against the officer corps of the Red Army worsened still further the position of the command cadres. . . . V. Putna, the Military Attaché of the Soviet Union in London, was falsely accused of underground counter-revolutionary, Trotskyite activity. At the open trial of 'anti-Soviet Trotskyite centre' in January 1937, the name of the Marshal of the Soviet Union, M. N. Tukhachevsky, was mentioned. . . .

The Red Army lost its best commanders just at the time when the clouds of war grew ever darker on the horizon.

It was far from simple to train, in a short time, new commanders of regiments, brigades, divisions, and corps. The commanders of units promoted to these positions often lacked knowledge and experience, and this could not be compensated merely by ability and devotion to duty. At the beginning of the war only 7 per cent of officers had higher military training, 37 per cent did not have full middle military training. By the summer of 1941 about 75 per cent of commanders and 70 per cent of political workers had worked in their posts for not more than a year. . . .

Stalin received systematic information of the preparations for an attack on the USSR. . . .

F. I. Golikov, Marshal of the Soviet Union, was head of the Intelligence Administration of the General Staff at the time when Germany was preparing an attack on the USSR in the middle of July 1940. Talking to the author of this book, the Marshal answered a series of questions on events preceding the war.

'*Question*: Much has been written abroad of the warnings of imminent attack which the Soviet Union received through various channels. The impression is created that the first warning was in March 1941 (statement of the American Assistant Secretary of State, S. Welles, to the Soviet Ambassador K. Umansky). Is this so?

Answer: No, this is incorrect. The first warning was received through the Soviet Intelligence much earlier than March 1941. The Intelligence Administration did a great deal of work in obtaining and analysing information received through various channels about the intentions of Hitlerite Germany, particularly and in the first place, about those against the Soviet state. In addition to obtaining and

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

analysing extensive data from agents, the Intelligence Administration carefully studied international information, the foreign press, expressions of public opinion and the military-political and military-technical literature of Germany and of other countries, etc. Soviet Military Intelligence had at its disposal reliable and proved sources for receiving secret information in a number of countries, including Germany itself. Therefore, American information was not, and in any case could not have been, news for the political and military leadership of our country from Stalin downwards'.

Marshal of the Soviet Union I. Kh. Bagramyan also considers that enough information was available 'to form a sober judgment about the attack in preparation against the Soviet Union'. . . .

Stalin's actions during this period were extremely contradictory. On the one hand they showed his desire to go on clinging to an obsolete dogma, on the other they gave evidence of his uncertainty and fear of war. . . .

His actions, which are difficult to explain, were apparently deeply rooted in his schematic understanding of the outside world, which he could judge only on such information as he received, or rather which he wished to receive. Not once, up to that time, did he cross the frontiers of the Soviet Union. He travelled extremely little even within his own country. It is obvious from his statements, speeches, and addresses that he considered Britain as the chief enemy of the Soviet state. This feeling must have been even more acute in 1941, since the old enemy of the Soviet regime, Winston Churchill, an experienced and wily politician, was at the head of the British Government. There is no doubt that the sudden flight to England of Hitler's deputy in the Nazi Party, Rudolf Hess, increased Stalin's suspicions about the intrigues of 'perfidious Albion'. . . . Hess's flight made a big impression on Stalin. As his subsequent conversations on this subject with Churchill and Beaverbrook showed, he was certain that Britain was inciting Germany to attack the USSR, that secret negotiations were taking place in London based on Hess's proposals. If these circumstances are not taken into account, it is very difficult to understand Stalin's inner hostility towards any new reports, in the course of the last month before the war, about Germany's preparations for an attack on the Soviet Union. He considered such reports as a British provocation. During April–June 1941, Stalin continued to do everything in his power to assure Germany that he intended to continue to keep strictly to the political and economic agreements which had been concluded. All this took place at the time when Germany was moving its armies up towards the Soviet frontiers, and was breaking economic agreements by keeping back deliveries of equipment to the Soviet Union, in particular of gun turrets for tanks. . . .

At the beginning of June, the point of view most widely held in international political circles was that Stalin was so impressed by Germany's military power that he was prepared to do anything to avoid war in the summer of 1941.

The Councillor of the German Embassy in Moscow, Hilger, sums up his impressions of that time in the following way: 'Everything

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointed to the fact that he [Stalin] assumed that Hitler was playing the game with a view to blackmail and that sudden demands for economic or even territorial concessions would follow the threatening movements of armies. He apparently believed that he could reach agreement with Hitler when these demands were presented. . . .'

If these impressions correctly reflected the state of affairs, they merely go to show that Stalin had no real idea of the world situation, and they bear witness to his anxieties in connection with Soviet unpreparedness for repulsing German aggression. But, whatever conclusions Stalin came to, nothing can justify his refusal to take elementary precautions in case a German attack should, after all, take place. . . .

The initial success of the German fascist armies in the war against the USSR was made possible as a result of all these circumstances. It is quite clear that the war would have started differently and would have assumed quite a different course, if the Hitlerite army had been stopped on the territory of the frontier districts.

Discussion of Nekrich's book

Agenda: discussion of A. M. Nekrich's book *22 June 1941*. Audience of 130. On the platform: Major-General E. A. Boltin, Major-General B. S. Telpukhovsky, Professor G. A. Deborin, and Professor of History A. M. Nekrich. Chairman of session: Boltin.

DEBORIN: The principal purpose of today's meeting is to seek the causes of our army's reverses at the beginning of the war. In the first part of his book, with the heading 'What they hid from us', Nekrich adopts an erroneous position; he explains everything by the obstinate stupidity of Stalin himself. That is a superficial analysis, from which it would follow that the problem is no longer of any interest, since Stalin is dead. This is incorrect: Stalin is not the only person involved.

The author relies in one passage of his book on an assertion by General Golikov who was, at the time, head of the information services of the Red Army staff. But Golikov did not so much inform the government as lie to it. His reports were in many cases completely untrue. They were always in two parts: in the first part he reported information which he classified as '*from reliable sources*'; here, for example, he included everything that supported the forecast of Germany's invading Great Britain. In the second part of his communications he reported information '*from doubtful sources*': for example, information from the spy Richard Sorge about the date on which Germany would attack the USSR. One must expand the criticism of the personality cult and say that certain people composed their reports in such a way as to please Stalin, at the expense of truth.

The Tass Agency communiqué of 14 June 1941 is a normal diplomatic manoeuvre. It was a question, at that time, of testing the reactions of the German government. In view of the internal situation people accepted that communiqué as true.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In estimating Stalin's action it is unnecessary to refer to Khrushchev's declarations, which are not objective. For example, it is difficult to accept the statement that Stalin was afraid of war. In so far as he received false information, Stalin reached false conclusions. He placed too much hope in the German-Soviet pact, while the Germans, protected by the pact, were getting ready to attack. But Stalin's estimate of German intentions was endorsed by all those around him. So Stalin cannot be considered solely responsible for his mistakes.

Moreover, Nekrich commits serious errors of fact; for example, in the matter of the 45 mm guns. I must point out that these guns were useless against the German tanks, and the government halted their production for that reason.

VOICE FROM THE HALL: It's not true. The 45 lasted all through the war. It worked marvellously. It was criminal to stop producing it. We fought the German tanks with our bare hands. At the beginning of the war there was a complete lack of anti-tank weapons.

DEBORIN: Besides, it was known by Blucher and others that the Tukhachevsky-Yakir group were innocent; and yet they condemned them.

VOICE FROM THE HALL: They knew it perfectly well.

DEBORIN: All the same, comrades, I think no one can deny that Voroshilov and Budenny, who took part in the trial, were men of conscience and honour.

VOICE FROM THE HALL: Voroshilov was not at the trial. And how much honour and conscience did that lot have? Cowards and swine!

(*Excitement in the hall. Deborin leaves the rostrum.*)

ANFILOV (*of the Staff*): As for Voroshilov and Budenny, I must assert that they were men without honour. There are a number of documents in our archives which cannot at present be made public, but which lead us to an entirely negative judgment of these two men's activity. I will mention only one little incident. At a meeting, about the middle of 1937, Stalin said: 'Myself and Voroshilov, we came to Tsaritsyn in 1918, and within a week we had unmasked all the enemies of the people.' By that phrase Stalin was referring to a number of former staff and front-line officers who were honestly serving the Soviet regime.

VOICE FROM THE HALL: And they were all drowned in the river, without trial!

ANFILOV: 'While you', Stalin went on, 'are not even capable of unmasking your neighbours.' Voroshilov then intervened to express entire agreement with Stalin and to invite us to denounce our own friends and colleagues. It makes me feel sick, at parades, when I see Voroshilov at the tribune.

And now let us come to the beginning of the war. If all our forces had been completely ready for action, which was entirely Stalin's responsibility, we should not have begun the war with such disasters!

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And in general the war would not have been so long, so bloody, and so exhausting.

One must certainly also take into account the responsibility of important military chiefs. Golikov and Kuznetsov appear as heroes in their own speeches and memoirs. The truth is that Golikov gave Stalin a report dealing at length with plan Barbarossa, but with the comment that it was a fake by *agents provocateurs* who wanted to push the USSR into war with Germany. And Kuznetsov has written that when he received from Vorontsov, the Soviet naval attaché at Berlin, a report giving plans and dates of the German attack, he immediately gave the information to Stalin. True enough, but in what light did he present it? If you could read it, you would see that he claims Vorontsov's communication to be a trick of the German counter-espionage.

Nevertheless, Stalin remains the chief culprit. Not long ago I had a conversation with Zhukov. He told me that Golikov was directly responsible to Stalin and made no reports to anyone else, not even to the chief of staff (Zhukov) or the commissar for defence, Marshal Timoshenko. These two knew nothing about the plans and dates of the German attack. I have not been able to talk to Timoshenko: he talks to nobody.

ZASTAVENKO (*of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism*): The people around Stalin did not help him to get a true idea of the situation. On 5 June 1941 Kalinin could still say in a speech at the political-military academy that: 'The Germans are preparing to attack us, but we are ready. The sooner they come, the better: we will wring their necks'.

VOICE FROM THE HALL: Eyewash!

ZASTAVENKO: Anyway, that is what the politburo thought; they underestimated the German power. So Stalin is not the only one to blame for what happened.

(*Murmurs in the hall*)

DACHICHEV (*of the Staff*): Deborin was not correct about the 45 mm gun. At the beginning of the war its projectiles could pierce right through the armour of every type of German armoured vehicle. To stop its production was to disarm our units, because no other type of anti-tank gun was produced to replace the 45. So the army found itself without artillery or anti-tank munitions.

What is most serious is that Soviet sources for everything relating to that period are not always accessible. For example, in order to discuss the report of the Soviet attaché in Berlin that war would break out on 22 June one has to consult the books of the English historian Erickson. When shall we finally be given access to all the sources? It should be possible to find in the archives of the ministry of foreign affairs some information about the meeting between the German ambassador Schulenburg and Molotov, accompanied by Pavlov—a meeting in the course of which Schulenburg betrayed his own country by announcing that Germany would attack the USSR on 22 June. Schulenburg

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was weeping; he begged that the Red Army should be alerted so as to prevent Hitler from carrying out his plan. But Schulenburg was not believed.

Now a word about the trial of our military leaders (the Tukhachevsky-Yakir group). The forgery on which they were condemned was prepared by the Gestapo, but the idea was Stalin's; he had suggested it to the fascist leaders through General Skoblin. Unfortunately the documents relating to this are still inaccessible. Golikov was a criminal not only because he wrote his reports so as to please Stalin, but also because he got our best counter-espionage agents abroad arrested.

A VOICE FROM THE HALL: Including Sorge!

DACHICHEV: Has Nekrich's book completely cleared up the causes of the tragedy of June 1941? He should have gone deeper. It was Stalin who was chiefly responsible for this tragedy. It was he who made the situation in which the country then found itself. Stalin's greatest crime was to have eliminated the best cadres of our army and our party. All our leaders understood the international situation, but not one of them was courageous enough to fight to get the necessary measures taken for the defence of the country. That is their terrible guilt before the party and the people. There are people who still say that one ought not to speak badly of Stalin, that he was not the only one. That is not true. The driver of the bus is responsible for every accident that happens through his fault. Stalin had assumed the responsibility of sole driver. His guilt is immense.

It is also necessary to define more precisely the reasons which determined the attitudes of Churchill, Schulenburg, Halder, and Raeder (the two latter, key men on Hitler's staff, were opposed to a war with the USSR). It was not any love for our country that motivated these men. Hitler strongly influenced the decision of the German military when he declared at a summit meeting: 'The Red Army has been decapitated; 80 per cent of its leaders have been liquidated; the Red Army is weaker than it has ever been.' That was the fundamental factor influencing his decision; he had to make war before the new cadres were formed. Every historian should have the courage to tell the truth.

ROSHCHIN (*of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism*): I am not in agreement with what Deborin said about the Tass Agency communiqué: it was not a diplomatic manoeuvre but a crime. This communiqé morally disarmed the population. Stalin and those round him did everything to prevent the Soviet people from preparing for war. When Kuznetsov told Malenkov that the fleet had made certain preparations to be 'on a war footing', on 17 June 1941, Malenkov laughed at him and said: 'You're behaving as though war was going to break out tomorrow.' Zhdanov, who was present at this meeting, had a more serious attitude, but he too did nothing. Malenkov cancelled all the measures taken by Kuznetsov. But it is impossible to acquit our military leaders from equal responsibility.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MELNIKOV (*of the History Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences*): If we are to believe Deborin, Nekrich's book exaggerates Stalin's faults. On the contrary, he underestimates them.

Let us consider a problem which is so heavily taboo that it is still impossible to mention it. I mean the negotiations between Molotov and Hitler at Berlin in November 1940. To recall the situation: preparations for 'Barbarossa' were entering their final phase, and German troops were being moved towards the Soviet frontier. In the Balkans and Finland the Hitlerian diplomats were redoubling their activity. To hide these preparations from the Soviet government, Hitler then proposed a meeting at the highest level. The president of the council of people's commissars, Molotov, went to Berlin. Hitler expounded to him a very broad general plan for dividing up the world. Molotov claimed the Straits, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Finland: but Hitler was unwilling to go into so much detail, for fear of 'leaks' to his future allies. His reply to Molotov's demands was an invitation to the Soviet Union to join the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis.

VASILENKO (*of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism*): Objectively, we possessed everything necessary for resisting the German attack. But Stalin ruined everything. And afterwards, to explain away his disgraceful defeat, he advanced the ridiculous theory that the aggressor is always the better prepared for war.

KULISH: To ask whether Stalin's guilt was total or limited is still a typical attitude of the personality cult. One is still concentrating on Stalin. We should look into the problem more deeply. We should ask how such a situation was able to come about. How did the government, under Stalin's direction, govern the country? How did it defend our people against the danger? Was it equal to its responsibilities? The answer is: NO. We must analyse the process which allowed Stalin, who was not equal to his task, to become head of the party and the state, with unlimited powers.

GNEDIN: Nekrich's book is good. I had not intended to speak, but the discussion has taken a turn which obliges me to intervene. It was I who for two years delivered to Stalin and Molotov the reports of the information services. All of them passed through my hands. It is quite true that Golikov was a '*misinformer*'. But that is not the point. All the 'reliable' parts of Golikov's regular reports appeared in one form or another in our official press. Stalin, however, on principle was only interested in the information classed by Golikov as 'doubtful'. Stalin knew everything, and his policy was to take no measures. Golikov is responsible for the repression which fell upon the GPU cadres; but he is not responsible for the fact that no defence measures were taken. In our histories we read that Stalin became head of the government on 5 May 1941 in order 'to prepare for the country's defence'. But there is nothing to justify such a statement. The fact is that Stalin did nothing to strengthen the country's defensive capacity. There is every reason

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to believe that Stalin took over the government not to prepare for the country's defence, but to reach an agreement with Hitler.

SLEZKIN (*of the History Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences*): I was at the front and took part, at the age of 19, in the June 1941 fighting. There can be no hesitation in saying that Stalin's behaviour was criminal. There was a vicious circle of personality cult, provocation, and repression. Everyone tried to please his superior by supplying only the information that might gratify him, or playing down anything that might annoy him. No one attempted to give a personal opinion. All this was the cause of immeasurable damage to the country, and everyone is guilty in his own way, if only for not daring to say what he thought. And the responsibility is heavier in proportion to one's place in the hierarchy, because the greater one's privileges the greater the crime of suppressing the truth to safeguard them. Stalin is the chief culprit. The 1939 pact was perhaps inevitable, but it was a crime to base any hopes on this pact and, above all, to stop the fight against fascism. And that is what Stalin ordered.

YAKIR (*of the History Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences*): Some of the speakers who have preceded me have referred to 'comrade Stalin'. It is an improper expression. Stalin was nobody's comrade and, above all, not ours. Stalin impeded the development of our armanents by eliminating many eminent technicians, and among them the creators of our artillery: Ikhomirov, Lannemann (the inventor of the 'Katyusha'), Kurchevsky, Bekhauri. We should also look at the question of the concentration camps, and study it from an economic standpoint. We were at war, and in the concentration camps there were millions of able-bodied men, specialists in every department of the country's economic and military life. And the task of guarding them absorbed considerable forces.

TELEGYN: Nekrich shows no evidence of critical spirit as regards foreign sources, and in particular as regards memoirs which contain very little truth.

A VOICE FROM THE HALL: And what about our own memories?

TELEGYN: In our own memories too there is a great deal of nonsense (*laughter*) and one should recollect that in those memories there are obvious traces of the exaggerations of the Khrushchev period (*murmurs*).

PETROVSKY (*of the Institute of Historical Archives*): We must remember that fascism first appeared during Lenin's life-time: Mussolini in Italy, the Kapp putsch, etc. Lenin designated fascism as the chief enemy. Stalin paid no attention to Lenin's view and said that the chief enemy was social-democracy. His theory was broadcast far and wide, and it set millions of workers against one another all over the world. That is what enabled fascism to win power. Stalin is a criminal.

BOLTIN: Comrade Petrovsky, in this hall and on this platform one must watch one's language. Are you a communist?

PETROVSKY: Yes.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOLTIN: I am not aware of any text, or directive, or party resolution, which obliges us to consider Stalin as a criminal.

PETROVSKY: The twenty-third party congress decided to remove Stalin from the mausoleum because of his offences, his crimes, against the party. Therefore he is a criminal.

SNEGOV: Nekrich's book is honest and useful. If a unit is disorganised on the eve of combat, with the rifles in one place and their bolts in another, and the scouts and sentries asleep, then that unit suffers a defeat. The head of such a unit is generally shot by order of the high command, and there's no more to say. Stalin was both the supreme commander and the head of the unit; and that unit, in a state of disorganisation, was our whole country. Stalin ought to have been shot. Instead of which, people are now trying to whitewash him.

Why is Nekrich's book, which accuses Stalin, so hurriedly criticised and even condemned, while the book by the notorious falsifier of history, I. Petrov, which credits Stalin with merits he never possessed, has still, after years, not come up for criticism? Why has Deborin tried to justify Stalin? When Hitler was preparing to attack Poland, Stalin helped him. He had all the Polish communists in the USSR shot, and outlawed the Polish communist party. Why was the fourth partition of Poland described as a Liberation? How can one be a communist and speak smoothly about Stalin—who betrayed and sold communists, who eliminated nearly all the delegates of the eighteenth congress and nearly all the central committee members elected by it, and who betrayed the Spanish Republic, Poland, and all communists in all countries?

DEBORIN (*summing up*): It has not been my task to defend or justify Stalin. What is needed is to examine the personality cult more deeply in all its aspects. As for Snegov's contribution, we have heard more than once what he told us about Poland; but we heard it from the opposite camp. It is the thesis of the West German professor, Jacobson, among others. It is strange that Snegov should hold the same point of view. Comrade Snegov, you ought to tell us which camp you belong to!

SNEGOV: The Kolyma camp.

DEBORIN: Such things need to be gone into.

A VOICE FROM THE HALL: D'you want the telephone number too? Like in the good old days?

(*Uproar. Deborin is shouted down.*)

NEKRICH: I am grateful for your observations. Deborin certainly does not hold the views that have been attributed to him; but in the heat of discussion there is a tendency to exaggerate. It is Stalin who bears the chief responsibility for the heavy defeat and all the tragedy of the first part of the war. All the same, nobody ought to provide his own superiors with inexact information because it will give them pleasure. Stalinism began because of us, the small people. Stalin wanted to trick Hitler; but instead of that he got himself into a maze which led to disaster. He knew better than anyone about the elimination of the leading cadres and the weaknesses of the army.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SNEGOV: I thought this was to be a scientific discussion; but instead of scientific demonstration Deborin has produced 1937-type arguments. But it's not easy to frighten us with concentration camps. We won't let ourselves be intimidated. Times have changed, and the past won't come back. (*Applause*).

BOLTIN (*summing up*): The meeting has elicited much that is new and interesting on the general problem. The interventions by Comrades Snegov and Petrovsky were very passionate. One may agree with much that Comrade Snegov said, but not with all of it. One cannot attribute to our country the intention of depriving Poland of its independence and dismembering it. That is the view of bourgeois historians and White emigrés. The fact is that we defended the independence of Poland. Certain comrades have described as exaggerations the criticisms of the personality cult that were made during the Khrushchev period. That is a radically mistaken view. The twentieth and twenty-second congress resolutions on the personality cult are not exaggerations due to the Khrushchev period; they are of vital importance for every communist.

(*The session was closed.*)

China

Stalin was 'our sun', 'our great leader and teacher', and 'the supreme commander', besides being a great many other things, such as 'the Coryphaeus of science', but he was never 'the great helmsman'. This expression is obviously an original Chinese contribution to the litany of the 'personality cult'. Its evolution in China can be seen by comparing the first document published in this section, an extract from the People's Daily *of eleven years ago, with those which follow it.*

On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

People's Daily, 5 April 1956

When any leader of the party or the state places himself over and above the party and the masses instead of in their midst, when he alienates himself from the masses, he ceases to have an all-round, penetrating insight into the affairs of the state. As long as this was the case, even so outstanding a personality as Stalin could not avoid making unrealistic and erroneous decisions on certain important matters. Stalin failed to draw lessons from isolated, local, and temporary mistakes on certain issues and so failed to prevent them from becoming serious mistakes of a nation-wide or prolonged nature. During the latter part of his life, Stalin took more and more pleasure in this cult of the individual, and violated the party's system of democratic centralism and the principle of combining collective leadership with individual responsibility. *As a result he made some serious*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mistakes such as the following: he broadened the scope of the suppression of counter-revolution; he lacked the necessary vigilance on the eve of the anti-fascist war; he failed to pay proper attention to the further development of agriculture and the material welfare of the peasantry; he gave certain wrong advice on the international communist movement, and, in particular, made a wrong decision on the question of Yugoslavia. On these issues, Stalin fell victim to subjectivism and one-sidedness, and divorced himself from objective reality and from the masses.

The cult of the individual is a foul carry-over from the long history of mankind. The cult of the individual is rooted not only in the exploiting classes but also in the small producers. As is well known, patriarchalism is a product of small-producer economy. After the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, even when the exploiting classes are eliminated, when small-producer economy has been replaced by a collective economy and a socialist society has been founded, certain rotten, poisonous ideological survivals of the old society may still remain in people's minds for a very long time. 'The force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a most terrible force' (Lenin) . . .

The Chinese Communist Party congratulates the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on its great achievements in this historic struggle against the cult of the individual. The experience of the Chinese revolution, too, testifies that it is only by relying on the wisdom of the masses of the people, on democratic centralism, and on the system of combining collective leadership with individual responsibility, that our party can score great victories and do great things in times of revolution and in times of national construction. The Chinese Communist Party, in its revolutionary ranks, has incessantly fought against elevation of the self and against individualist heroism, both of which mean isolation from the masses. Undoubtedly, such things will exist for a long time to come. Even when overcome, they re-emerge. They are found sometimes in one person, sometimes in another. When attention is paid to the role of the individual, the role of the masses and the collective is often ignored. That is why some people easily fall into the mistake of self-conceit or blind faith in themselves or blind worship of others. We must therefore give unremitting attention to opposing elevation of the self, individualist heroism, and the cult of the individual.

Essential Points for Propaganda and Education in Connection with the Great Cultural Revolution (excerpts)

Liberation Army Daily, 6 June 1966

The most fundamental task of the great proletarian cultural revolution of our country is to study and apply Mao Tse-tung's thought in a

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creative way and popularise it in the course of the stormy class struggle, so that it becomes integrated with the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers. Every comrade should earnestly undertake the study of Chairman Mao's works and the application of his thought in a creative way, and in the course of struggle take a step forward in grasping Mao Tse-tung's thought.

We should take up the various questions arising in the present great cultural revolution and turn to and earnestly study the relevant writings or extracts from Chairman Mao's works. These include, for instance, his expositions on classes and class struggle in socialist society, on the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the line for the cultural revolution, on the protracted and complex nature of the class struggle in the ideological field, on how to distinguish fragrant flowers from poisonous weeds, on ideological remoulding, and so on.

In accordance with the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, Chairman Mao has summed up the practical experience of the Chinese and world revolutions and the tragic lesson of the Soviet Party and state being usurped by the modern revisionist clique; he has formulated systematic theories and policies for the period of socialism concerning the need to keep a vigorous grip on the class struggle, persist in the dictatorship of the proletariat, prevent and oppose modern revisionism and prevent the restoration of capitalism; he has thus greatly enriched and developed Marxist-Leninist theory on the dictatorship of the proletariat. In this great cultural revolution, we must advance our study and comprehension of these instructions of Chairman Mao and take them as the supreme guide to all our work and our sole criterion for distinguishing right from wrong, truth from falsehood.

In a complex struggle, we must distinguish genuine Marxism-Leninism from sham Marxism-Leninism and fragrant flowers from poisonous weeds. We should resolutely support and steadfastly carry out all that conforms to Mao Tse-tung's thought. As for anyone who contravenes or opposes Mao Tse-tung's thought, we will expose him to the light of day, repudiate and discredit him thoroughly no matter what high position he holds or whatever 'authority' he is.

Mao Tse-tung's thought is the acme of Marxism-Leninism in our epoch. It is living Marxism-Leninism at its highest and the sharpest weapon to combat imperialism, modern revisionism and all reactionaries. In the magic mirror of Mao Tse-tung's thought, all monsters will be revealed for what they are. Once again the great proletarian cultural revolution is providing a vivid demonstration of the fact that once Mao Tse-tung's thought is grasped by the masses of workers, peasants and soldiers, it becomes a mighty material force. People armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought are the greatest fighting force; they have the greatest courage, wisdom and unanimity of will. When they grasp Mao Tse-tung's thought, which is both a political telescope and a political microscope, the worker, peasant, and soldier masses have

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the highest criterion to distinguish right from wrong, they have the vantage ground from which to see far ahead, and they can discern the essence through the appearance. People who possess Mao Tse-tung's thought have the keenest nose and the sharpest eyes, and no anti-party, anti-socialist element can escape their notice no matter what tricks he plays.

This is precisely why the enemy fears Mao Tse-tung's thought most of all and has the greatest hatred for it. But the more the enemy opposes it, the more ardently we love it. We must persist in studying Chairman Mao's works and applying his thought creatively. The revolution requires it, the situation requires it, the struggle against the enemy requires it, good preparatory work for smashing the US imperialist war of aggression requires it, and the prevention of and opposition to revisionism and the thwarting of capitalist restoration require it. Mao Tse-tung's thought is our very life. Anyone who opposes it will be condemned by the whole party and denounced by the whole nation.

The Chinese People's Liberation Army is a people's army personally created by Chairman Mao. Every one of our comrades has grown up nourished by Mao Tse-tung's thought. The Central Committee of the party, Chairman Mao, the Military Commission of the Central Committee and Comrade Lin Piao have all called on us to join in criticising reactionary bourgeois ideas and to play a major role in the great cultural revolution. We are determined not to fall short of their expectations.

We shall conscientiously study the instructions of the party's Central Committee and Chairman Mao on the great cultural revolution and be thoroughgoing revolutionaries. Alongside the people of the whole country, we shall completely destroy the black anti-party, anti-socialist line, safeguard our dictatorship of the proletariat, safeguard the Central Committee of the party, Chairman Mao and Mao Tse-tung's thought.

In taking part in the great cultural revolution, we must go further in giving prominence to politics, in putting the 'four goods' on a solid footing and in strengthening our combat-readiness. While struggling against the enemy without guns, we should give close attention to the enemy with guns. Should US imperialism dare to impose war on the Chinese people, we shall definitely annihilate it, resolutely, thoroughly, wholly and completely.

We must steadfastly adhere to the directives of the party's Central Committee, the Military Commission and Comrade Lin Piao to study Chairman Mao's works, follow his teachings, act in accordance with his instructions, and be good soldiers of Chairman Mao. We must never forget the class struggle, never forget the dictatorship of the proletariat, never forget to give prominence to politics and never forget to hold high the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought—so that we shall carry our cause of socialist revolution and socialist construction forward from one great new victory to another!

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution adopted 8 August 1966 (extract)

In the great proletarian cultural revolution, it is imperative to hold aloft the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought and put proletarian politics in command. The movement for the creative study and application of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's works should be carried forward among the masses of the workers, peasants and soldiers, the cadres and the intellectuals, and Mao Tse-tung's thought should be taken as the guide to action in the cultural revolution.

In this complex great cultural revolution, Party committees at all levels must study and apply Chairman Mao's works all the more conscientiously and in a creative way. In particular, they must study over and over again Chairman Mao's writings on the cultural revolution and on the Party's methods of leadership, such as *On New Democracy, Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art, On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People, Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work, Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership*, and *Methods of Work of Party Committees.*

Party committees at all levels must abide by the directions given by Chairman Mao over the years, namely that they should thoroughly apply the mass line of 'from the masses, to the masses' and that they should be pupils before they become teachers. They should try to avoid being one-sided or narrow. They should foster materialist dialectics and oppose metaphysics and scholasticism.

The great proletarian cultural revolution is bound to achieve brilliant victory under the leadership of the Central Committee of the Party headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

Put Mao Tse-tung's thought in the forefront; cadres give the lead at every level

Red Flag, 1966, no. 8

The experience of China's revolutionary struggles in the past decades may be summarised in thousands of points, but in the final analysis, they boil down to one single point: Chairman Mao's works are the supreme guide for work in all fields; Mao Tse-tung's thought is the fundamental guarantee of victory for all work. When Mao Tse-tung's thought is placed in the forefront, our cause advances irresistibly and triumphantly. This was the case during the period of the new-democratic revolution; it is also the case during the period of the socialist revolution. This is true of the socialist revolution on the economic and political fronts; it is also true of the socialist revolution on the ideological and cultural fronts.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A great movement for the creative study and application of Chairman Mao's works has unfolded in the past few years among the masses of the workers, peasants, soldiers and revolutionary cadres. Mao Tse-tung's thought has penetrated deeper and deeper into the hearts and minds of the people and is being mastered by more and more people. For this reason, the socialist revolution has developed in greater scope and depth and socialist construction has advanced in ever bigger strides, with one miracle after another being created in every field of work . . .

The socialist education movement in China's vast countryside and in the cities, launched under the guidance of Mao Tse-tung's thought, is a struggle between the proletarian and bourgeois classes, between the two roads: socialism and capitalism; it is a great socialist revolutionary movement. The basic experience derived from it is also that Mao Tse-tung's thought must be placed in the forefront. Wherever Mao Tse-tung's writings are studied and applied well and penetrate into the hearts and minds of the people, there the movement is deep-rooted and thoroughgoing, the ideological outlook of the people undergoes revolutionary and radical change, and a new situation appears in production.

Similarly in the great proletarian cultural revolution, we must ensure that Mao Tse-tung's thought is placed in the forefront. How are we to see through monsters? How are we to see through representatives of the bourgeoisie who have wormed their way into the Party? We must rely on Mao Tse-tung's thought and we must rely on it, too, to sweep away all monsters and thoroughly defeat those representatives of the bourgeoisie who have wormed their way into the Party.

The watershed dividing Marxism-Leninism from revisionism and revolution from counter-revolution lies between the alternatives of whether one supports or opposes the placing of Mao Tse-tung's thought in the forefront, whether one supports putting Mao Tse-tung's thought in command, supports putting 'politics in command,' or advocates money-making in command and the placing of professional work in command.

The creative study and application of Chairman Mao's works and the placing of Mao Tse-tung's thought in the forefront persistently in all work must rely on strong leadership by the Party committees at all levels, and the cadres giving the lead at all levels. This is a most important guarantee . . .

If cadres and the masses study Chairman Mao's works conscientiously, follow Chairman Mao's teachings, and act in accordance with Chairman Mao's instructions, their ideological outlook will be transformed, the relations between cadres and the masses will change, the way they work will change and the situation in production will change.

With the cadres giving the lead at all levels, the ranks of activists studying Chairman Mao's works will grow steadily and their level

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will gradually rise. Thus a still broader and deeper mass movement will be formed for creatively studying and applying Chairman Mao's works, so that Mao Tse-tung's thought takes deep root in the minds of the masses and is really placed in the forefront in all work. This is the fundamental guarantee for carrying the socialist revolution through to the end, consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and adhering to the correct orientation for socialist construction.

It is the conclusion and the call of the Party to place Mao Tse-tung's thought in the forefront, and for cadres to give the lead at all levels.

Chairman Mao is the never-setting Red Sun in our hearts (extracts)*

Chinese Literature, No. 11, 1966

Long live Chairman Mao,
The great teacher
Great leader
Great supreme commander
And great helmsman!

Sailing the seas depends on the helmsman, the growth of everything depends on the sun, and making revolution depends on Mao Tse-tung's thought. Under the personal direction of our great leader Chairman Mao, an upsurge of the great proletarian cultural revolution without parallel in history is gathering momentum in our country . . .

Respected and beloved Chairman Mao, you are the great teacher, great leader, great supreme commander and great helmsman of the people of all nationalities in our country. The hearts of the people of all nationalities are turned towards you and will always be with you to carry the revolution through to the end.

Respected and beloved Chairman Mao, you are the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our time. It is you who have inherited, defended and developed Marxism-Leninism with genius, creatively and in an all-round way, and have elevated Marxism-Leninism to a completely new stage . . .

Respected and beloved Chairman Mao, you are the most brilliant leader and greatest genius of the proletariat in the present era. Your heart will always be one with the hearts of the revolutionary masses. You are the never-setting red sun in our hearts.

Sailing the seas depends on the helmsman, and our great helmsman is Chairman Mao.

'With the brilliant leadership of Chairman Mao and having mastered Mao Tse-tung's thought which is the keenest weapon, we

* This is the commentary to the documentary colour film *Chairman Mao with a Million Members of the Cultural Revolutionary Army.*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be invincible and all-conquering and will achieve complete victory in the great proletarian cultural revolution! '

In the great proletarian cultural revolution we must thoroughly smash bourgeois ideology and establish the complete ascendancy of Mao Tse-tung's thought. 'We must hold aloft the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought, carry through to the end the great proletarian cultural revolution, build socialist China into an impregnable proletarian state and fulfil the glorious historic mission entrusted to us by the Chinese people and the revolutionary people of the world '.

Long live the great proletarian cultural revolution!
Long live the dictatorship of the proletariat!
Long live the great Communist Party of China!
Long live the invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung!
Long live the great leader Chairman Mao! Long live, long live Chairman Mao!

Chairman Mao's Great Hand *

Chinese Literature, 1966, No. 11

Come here quickly,
Revolutionary comrades,
Revolutionary companions in battle,
Come and shake my hand!

Today, Chairman Mao
Received us revolutionary masses,
And I shook his hand,
I shook Chairman Mao's great hand!

The hand of Chairman Mao
Writes red treatises that
Light up the world, as revolutionary
Gales sweep the five continents.

The hand of Chairman Mao
Holds the tiller of the revolution,
Pushing history forward
At flying speed.

Come here quickly,
Revolutionary comrades,
Revolutionary companions in battle,
Come and shake my hand!

Closely following Chairman Mao, let us
Advance hand in hand, demolish the old
World and plant the red banner of
Mao Tse-tung's thought the world over.

* This poem was written by members of a theatrical troupe in a PLA engineering corps.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Works of Chairman Mao Tse-tung have come! *

Chinese Literature, 1966, No. 11

They've come, they've come!
The works of Chairman Mao have come!
They've come, they've come!
Goldly gleaming truth has come!
Millions of burning hearts beat fast,
Millions of eyes shine with happy tears.
A sea of people, seething,
Flowers and bunting dance
As ringing voices sing: 'Best of all
I love to read the works of Chairman Mao'.
How many days and nights have
We longed for Chairman Mao's works
—The grain and weapon and
Compass of revolutionaries;
Can a navigator do without a lighthouse?
Can a revolutionary fighter do without a gun?
Can we criticise the old world thoroughly
Without the four brilliant volumes of Mao Tse-tung?
As bats fear the sunlight,
Chou Yang's black gang fear Mao Tse-tung's thought;
They cut the publication of Chairman Mao's works,
Vainly hoping to blockade revolutionary truth, strangle it;
But the huge waves of the Cultural Revolution
Smashed the anti-Party, anti-socialist black line;
The works will appear on a large scale—this decision of the Party's Central Committee makes our wish of years come true;
Why shouldn't we rejoice and cheer?
Why shouldn't we shed a happy tear?
Chairman Mao, we'll go with you for ever,
For ever read your works, heed your words;
We've much to tell you, but all can be
Expressed in this one heart-felt cry:
'Long, long life to Chairman Mao!' Our voices
Reach the farthest corners of the earth.

The Poetry of Mao Tse-tung

An interview with the translator I. S. Golubev (extracts)

Literaturnaya Gazeta, 11 January 1967

During the so-called 'Cultural Revolution' in China, all books not in accordance with the thought of Mao Tse-tung have been banned.

* This poem was collectively written by students of the Technological Institute of Peking.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is true of both classical and modern literature. The great classical poets of the Tang era, Li-Po, Tu-Fu, Po Chui-i, have been put down as members of the 'Black Gang'. Su Tun-po, the great poet of the Sung era, has been 'debunked', as have a number of other writers whose works belong to the treasury of world literature . . . The *Novosti* correspondents L. Andriyan and E. Kochubei asked the translator I. S. Golubev to talk about the work of the Chinese poets and also to give his opinion about the verse of Mao Tse-tung which Golubev, at the request of the Chinese, translated in 1957 for the newspaper *Friendship*, published in Russian in Peking.

Q. What can you say about the verse of Mao Tse-tung?

A. When Mao Tse-tung's poems were published, the Chinese critics described them as unparalleled masterpieces, and they declared the author to be 'the greatest poet of our era'. In January 1964 Mao Tse-tung wrote some further poems. A great hullabaloo was made on their publication. They appeared on the front page of all Chinese periodicals. Then they were set to music, and now they are sung by the 'Red Guards', who frequently don't even understand what they are about. The fact is that many of these verses are incomprehensible on a first reading, and even readers with a philological training cannot explain the exact sense of certain expressions.

Mao Tse-tung is a great admirer of mythical figures and of the ancient Emperors. One has the impression that the rulers of ancient times attract him as outstanding personalities, as supermen. This is how he sees himself: 'I am in the saddle with a whip in my hand' (*Three Poems of Sixteen Words*). Sometimes the whip is replaced by a sword, and he says he would like to 'wield the sword more firmly still'.

Q. How did you translate Mao Tse-tung's verse?

A. I did it together with the poet M. Basmanov. At first we studied it for about two months together with Chinese colleagues, using commentaries by prominent literary scholars. Then our translations were sent to Mao Tse-tung and were published only after he had approved them.

Q. You have translated poets who are now banned in China: Po Chui-i, Li-Po, Tsao-Chi, Lu Yu, Sun Tun-po. Since Mao Tse-tung imitates some of them, could you tell us how they compare?

A. In the first place I find the ancient poets easier to understand. I would say that their work is more imbued with social themes. They are very lyrical, as you can see by reading the good translations made by A. Gitovich. The ancient poets had a very good idea of what they were fighting for, and against whom. But Mao Tse-tung is like an ivory tower poet, and he speaks in the elaborate language of a feudal overlord. Here is a concrete example:

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tu-Fu (a classical poet)

Gangs run berserk, the people
starves without bread,
it is time our ruler
cut his victuals by half.

or

The peoples' sorrows
wound my heart,
the mandarins have forgotten
the word for 'pity'.

Mao Tse-tung [1]

Red, yellow, green,
Blue, black, mauve . . .
Who is dancing up there
With silk of many colours in their hand?
The evening rays flash out
After the great downpour,
Mountain after mountain
Rises up in the distance . . .
Here, many years ago
There was a battle-ground:
A wall still shows
Traces of the siege.
But now behold:
In garments of many colours
The mountain blossoms—
How beautiful it is!

After the 'cultural revolution' was launched in China, it became impossible to buy the works of any of the classical poets, but the poems of Mao Tse-tung have been brought out in huge editions . . . I have read all the published works of Mao Tse-tung. I can say with certainty that they are not always original. He has borrowed many of his ideas from the medieval novel, *Journey to the West*, by Wu Chen-en. And nihilism with regard to the achievements of world culture is nothing more than a development of the idea of the prominent Manchurian official, Po Hen, who died in 1871, and who, when he was secretary of the State Council, wrote in a memorandum to the Emperor: 'China is great, and there is no need to worry about lack of talent in our country. What do we need foreigners for? What have we to learn from them?'

[1] The translation of this poem, called 'Tapoti', directly from Chinese can be found in Jerome Ch'en, *Mao and the Chinese Revolution* (Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 333. The translators write: 'No doubt Mao's status as a poet has been enhanced by his eminence as a political figure; nevertheless his poetic abilities, although they are uneven, are of no mean order and would have secured him a place in contemporary Chinese literature independent of his pre-eminent position in the political sphere.' (Edit.)

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreword by Lin Piao to the Second edition of *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung*

Peking, December 1966

Comrade Mao Tse-tung is the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our time. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has, with genius and in a creative and all-round way, inherited, defended, and developed Marxism-Leninism, advancing it to a completely new stage.

Mao Tse-tung's thought is Marxism-Leninism in the era when imperialism is heading for total collapse and socialism is advancing to worldwide victory. Mao Tse-tung's thought is a powerful ideological weapon in opposing imperialism, a powerful ideological weapon in opposing both revisionism and dogmatism. Mao Tse-tung's thought is the guiding principle for all the work of the entire party, the entire army, and the entire country.

Therefore, the most fundamental test for the political and ideological work of our party is always to hold high the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought, to arm the minds of the people throughout the country with Mao Tse-tung's thought, and to persist in putting Mao Tse-tung's thought in command of all work. The broad masses of the workers, the peasants, and the soldiers, and the broad ranks of the revolutionary cadres and the revolutionary intellectuals must genuinely grasp Mao Tse-tung's thought and see to it that everyone studies Chairman Mao's writings, follows his teachings, acts according to his instructions, and becomes a good soldier of Chairman Mao.

It is necessary to study the works of Chairman Mao with problems in mind, study and apply them in a living way, combine study with practice, study first what is urgently needed so as to get quick results, and stress the effort to apply what one studies. In order really to grasp Mao Tse-tung's thought, it is necessary to study over and over many of Chairman Mao's basic concepts and it is best to memorise some of his adages and study and apply them repeatedly. The newspapers should frequently carry quotations from Chairman Mao in connection with the actual situation for their readers to study and apply. The experience of the broad masses in their living study and application of Chairman Mao's works in the past few years has proved that to study selected quotations from Chairman Mao with problems in mind is a good method for learning Mao Tse-tung's thought, a method conducive to quick results.

We have selected and compiled *Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung* with the purpose of helping the broad masses to learn Mao Tse-tung's thought more effectively. In organising study, the different units should select passages for study that are relevant to the situation, the tasks, current thinking among the masses, and the conditions of their work.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A new era is opening in our great country in which the workers, the peasants, and the soldiers are mastering Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought. Once Mao Tse-tung's thought is mastered by the broad masses, it will become an inexhaustible source of strength and an infinitely powerful spiritual atom bomb. The mass publication of *Quotations From Chairman Mao Tse-tung* is an extremely important measure for the broad masses to master Mao Tse-tung's thought and for the Chinese people to carry on the revolutionising of their ideology. It is our hope that all comrades will study seriously and diligently, launch a new high tide of living study and application of Chairman Mao's works throughout the country, and, under the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought, strive to build our country into a great socialist state with modern agriculture, modern industry, modern science and culture, and modern national defence!

How a God is made

Extracts from a broadcast by the deputy chief editor of the Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing House

Moscow Radio, 21 January 1967

The so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China is also a sad demonstration of the extent to which the public deification of Mao Tse-tung has now been carried. The Red Guards consider that Mao is their commander-in-chief and that they are his soldiers. The notion that it is not Marxism-Leninism which is now the ideology of the Chinese Communist Party, but the ideas of Mao Tse-tung, is being instilled in the younger generation with all the weapons in the ideological armoury. Recently the Minister of Defence, Lin Piao, declared unashamedly: 'Chairman Mao is much greater than Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin; there is at present no other man in the world who could be placed next to Chairman Mao'. It is asserted in China that 99 per cent of the time the Chinese spend studying the classics of Marxism must be devoted to the study of Mao's works, because they alone can form the text-book of revolution.

Mao Tse-tung also appears to the people like a god. He does not talk to the Red Guards, he only poses in front of them and the cine-cameras. During a period of one and a half months Mao Tse-tung made about 10 appearances at meetings on Tienanmen Square, but at none of them did he utter a single word. The spot on the Square where he sat on 1 October to watch the firework display after descending from the rostrum of Heavenly Peace is now considered to be in the nature of a sacred spot. The papers keep on writing about it; they describe how masses of Red Guards stream to the spot, full of joy that they

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can see the place where Chairman Mao sat. We watched them swear their oath of loyalty there, and saw how they rubbed off the red paint from the brick wall to put a finger-mark in their little red books in commemoration of this memorable occasion.

All Chinese towns are flooded with quotations from and articles by Mao: they are displayed in homes, in public places, in every bus, trolley bus, train, aircraft, and in police booths and taxis. Quotations from Mao Tse-tung's works are inscribed on huge specially constructed stands and on the sides of lorries and garbage trucks. All barrow-boys have them, and so do all cyclists as well as bicycle-rickshaws. Sometimes placards with Mao Tse-tung's thoughts are even hung round the necks of donkeys. Many young people wear Mao's thoughts on their chests, inscribed on pieces of red material or in the form of special badges. Today a Chinese cannot take a step without coming across a Mao thought. The collective reading in unison of these thoughts is organised at concerts, assemblies, and meetings; they are read out before the start of a film programme; and for the first time in ideological work, some of these thoughts have been set to music. Every day they are broadcast for 30 minutes. Three times a week political studies take place in workers' collectives. Everyone has his own personal summary of Mao's works. Mao's portraits are carried along the streets like icons; they are displayed in shop windows and over the entrances to offices and houses. During demonstrations participants carry only the booklets of Mao's thoughts and wave them about as if they were a kind of Bible.

In actual fact there is but one type of political and artistic literature available to the Chinese: the articles and poems of Mao Tse-tung. The booklet containing his thoughts has been published in editions of millions of copies. . . .

The Party masses and the working people are being systematically educated in the spirit of implicit obedience to the instructions of Chairman Mao, in the spirit of studying his ideas throughout life, with the help of all available propaganda means. . . .

We, a group of young Soviet tourists, saw all this quite openly. We experienced in a particularly striking way the strength of the ideological atmosphere in which the ordinary Chinese is placed when we left Shanghai by train for Peking. Our train was late; we had left Shanghai with 20 wagonloads of Red Guards and had spent half a day in sidings some 50 kilometres from Shanghai. Traffic was at a standstill and the ferry across the Yangtse was a gigantic bottle-neck. Long after midnight we were awakened by our companions and, after marching across rice fields and over sleepers, past trains with boilers cold and their passengers calm at last, we were taken back to the town.

We found ourselves at the airport in the morning. Hardly had we time to settle down on the comfortable low benches, when the traditional flower tea was brought to us. A young man appeared in the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

centre of the hall and, addressing us all, said: 'An amateur brigade propagating Mao's ideas will now perform'. A band made up of airport staff appeared and accompanied the singing of 'The East is Red', a song we heard for the umpteenth time. This was followed by the reading in unison, with waving of arms, of two thoughts of Mao from the little red book. In conclusion pretty young girls performed a dance with these books, their movements resembling an invocation to the Sun . . .

We had hardly taken our seats in the turbo-prop aircraft, when a Chinese stewardess appeared. After offering us the usual sweets, she first distributed the score of the song 'The Sun is Red' and then asked all passengers to sing this revolutionary song in unison. The illuminated instructions forbidding us to smoke and urging us to fasten our seat-belts had not yet been switched off, when she began conducting, waving her arms frantically and encouraging those Chinese who were singing it *sotto voce*. Some 15 minutes later we were all given four thoughts by Mao set to music.

The same happened when we landed at Peking. Now, however, the whole team of stewardesses demonstrated their skill in studying Mao's thoughts. We were asked to sit down in the airport building to await our luggage. Precisely two minutes later eight young girls appeared wearing grey uniforms with red buttonholes copied from the uniform of the People's Liberation Army. They asked all those present to listen to a performance by their poetesses, who not only praised Mao in verse, but had also set their verse to music. Unaccompanied and without any hesitation, the girls enthusiastically sang several songs . . .

At every step, every moment, we heard the name of the man who looks down upon every Chinese from every window of every shop, from the front page of every newspaper; his name hits every Chinese like a bullet or seeps into his brain, ten, a hundred, a thousand times a day.

By an unfortunate error, lines 10–20 *on p.* 104 *of the last issue of* Survey *were misplaced. They should come after line* 28.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

24th year

America's Leading Quarterly on Russia Past and Present

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW, for twenty years a free forum for scholars and writers, provides a broad survey of the Russian scene, political, historical, economic, and cultural. Drawing on scholars, writers and political leaders of pre-revolutionary Russia, and on well-known American and European specialists, this publication is the *only* authoritative organ devoted *entirely* to Russia, past and present.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW contains a varied selection of articles of current interest and permanent reference value. In addition, it publishes book reviews by outstanding authorities in the field of Russian affairs.

Subscriptions: U.S. $7.00 a year; Canada, $7.50;

foreign, $8.00; single issues, $2.00

CUMULATIVE INDEX (1941–1961), $2.00

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

P. O. Box 146 Hanover, N. H., U.S.A.

JOURNAL OF POLITICS

Vol. 29, No. 2

The May 1967 issue will contain:

Science and the Public Life: AVERY LEISERSON

International Law and Guantanamo: GARY L. MARIS

Social and Political Sources of Political Fragmentation in Japan: LEE W. FARNSWORTH

Judicial Structure and its Political Functioning in Society: New Approaches to Teaching and Research in Public Law: THEODORE L. BECKER

Social Backgrounds and Judicial Decisions: Notes for a Theory: JOEL B. GROSSMAN

The Structure of Electoral Politics: DAVID M. OLSON

Children's Orientations toward the President: Some Additional Theoretical Considerations and Data: DEAN JAROS

Presidential Assassination: A Case Study in the Dynamics of Political Socialization: KAREN ORREN AND PAUL PETERSON

Published quarterly by the

Southern Political Science Association
Peabody Hall, University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida, USA

Subscription and Membership Fee: $6.00 *U.S.A.;* $6.50 *Foreign;* $3.00 *Student*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PREUVES

revue mensuelle

publie dans son numéro de MARS 1967

RICHARD LOWENTHAL: Des idéogrammes sur les murs

STUART R. SCHRAM: Mao Tsé-toung: l'homme et sa doctrine

FRANCOIS FEJTO: Le P.C.F. a-t-il changé?

ANNIE KRIEGEL: Août 1914: nationalisme et internationalisme ouvriers

YVES BONNEFOY: L'obstination de Chestov

ANDRE THIERY: Technologie et progrès

PREUVES: 18, avenue de l'Opéra—PARIS (1er)
Le N° de 96 pp. illu.—France: 4 F.20—Etranger: 4 F.60
C.C.P. PARIS 178-00

Un ancien numéro sera gracieusement envoyé sur simple demande comme spécimen

THE CHINA QUARTERLY

No. 29 JANUARY–MARCH 1967

THE GREAT PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

Origin and Development *Philip Bridgham*

The 'Regularisation' of Cadres *Ezra F. Vogel*

CHINESE COMMUNIST HISTORY

The Guerrilla Movement in Northwest China (Part II) *Mark Selden*

The Urban Communes in Communist China *Janet Salaff*

Peking and the Latin American Communists *Ernst Halperin*

BOOK REVIEWS

QUARTERLY CHRONICLE AND DOCUMENTATION

Editorial and Business Offices:
ILFORD HOUSE, 133 OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.1
Subscription rates: £2 or $6 a year, post free
Student rates: £1 or $4

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SURVEY

A Journal of Soviet and East European Studies

The Soviet Union and 'The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution' in China

Introduction *Leopold Labedz*

The Soviet Press on the 'Cultural Revolution'

Official Exchanges and Comments

Inside China: Eyewitnesses

Red Guards and Posters

Literature, the Arts, Education

The Press

Cultural Exchanges

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The Army

Communist Party Opinion

'Collusion' with the United States

Diplomatic Protests

The Chinese Road to Socialism for Russia and Poland

The Personality Cult in Russia and China

Printed in Great Britain by The Eastern Press, Ltd., London and Reading

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED